

The Halabi Papers

Part 2 : A Response to the Permanent Committee's Verdict

Version 1.03 22nd September 2000

From the Words of Imaam Ibn Baaz

Imaam Ibn Baaz was asked, "Is replacement (of the Shari'ah) with the secular laws (tabdeel ul-qawaaneen) considered to be major kufr that expels from the religion?". He replied, **"When he makes it permissible (istibaaha). When he makes it permissible to judge with a law other than the Shari'ah he becomes a disbeliever with the major kufr – if he makes that permissible..."** Ibn Baz then quoted the verse in al-Ma'idah (5:44) and then proceeded to quote the tafseer of Ibn Abbaas, "kufr doona kufr". Then the questioner said, "Is there a difference between replacement (tabdeel) and between ruling in a particular issue? ... Tabdeel O Shaikh?" To which the Shaikh replied, "This (i.e. the above explanation) covers all of the manifestations, in all of the manifestations..."

Refer to the book, "Hiwaar Hawla Masaa'il it-Takfeer Ma'a Allaamah ash-Shaikh Abdul-Azeez Ibn Baaz" and it is found also in al-Furqaan Magazine (no. 94)

BENEFIT

Stated Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen (hafidhahullaah):

“Whoever accused Shaikh al-Albaanee of Irjaa’ has erred. Either he is one who does not know al-Albaanee or he is one who does not know Irjaa’.”¹

Al-Albaanee is a man from Ahl us-Sunnah – may Allaah have mercy upon him –, a defender of it, an Imaam in Hadeeth. We do not know of anyone who has surpassed him in our time. However, some people – and we ask Allaah’s pardon – **have jealousy in their hearts**. For when [one of them] sees that a person has been met with acceptance [by the people], he begins to find fault with him on account of something, just like the hypocrites, those who used to defame those believers who would give freely in charity – and those [i.e. hypocrites] who would find nothing but the striving of [the believers]. So they would defame the one who would give charity in abundance, and also the poor person who would give charity!

We know the man from his books – may Allaah have mercy upon him – and I know him from sitting with him on occasions. He is Salafi in aqeedah, of sound manhaj. **However some people desire to perform takfeer of the servants of Allaah on account of something that Allaah did not perform takfeer of them. Then they claim that whoever opposes them in this takfeer is a Murji’ – a lie, slander, and mighty fabrication.**

Therefore, do not listen to this saying regardless of whomever it comes from!”

Source: Cassette: Makaalamaat Ma’a Mashaayikh ad-Da’wah as-Salafiyyah (Part 4)

Dated 12th July 2000 CE

¹ And it is as if Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen understands precisely and succinctly, the sad state of affairs!!

BENEFIT

Stated Shaikh Ali Hasan Abdul-Hameed – hafidhahullaah:

“And I have also said, that I certainly do fear that al-Albani would be the first one to be chosen (for the accusation of al-Irjaa’) and the last will be Ibn Baaz. And I see this matter occurring in the very near future. So I hope that my words and this suspicion of mine is falsehood. And I hope that my words that Shaikh Ibn Baaz should be accused with al-Irjaa’ are falsehood.

This is because those who say that Shaikh al-Albani is a Murji’ because he makes takfir of the one who rules by other than what Allaah has revealed [in all its forms] on account of Istihlaal (only) – **then this is the saying of Shaikh Ibn Baaz, word for word, in the second volume of his fataawaa**. So what exactly is it that has made them say Shaikh Naasir is a Murji’ and that Shaikh Ibn Baaz is not a Murji’?²

They are waiting for the death of the scholars so that they can have an open field.”

Source: Cassette:Question and Answer Session, Birmingham UK

Dated 29th July 2000 CE

² And if a partisan Qutubi, wallowing in the Extremism of his Irjaa’ towards the statements of apostasy of his sayyid – equating between a Raafidee and the Shaikhs of Islaam - should bark, “because Shaikh Ibn Baaz holds that kufr can occur by action and statements” and that “actions are from Imaan”, then the reply to this ignorant one is that this too is the madhhab of Shaikh al-Albaanee, word for word, letter for letter. Refer to **MSC060006**.

CONTENTS

Introduction

Shaikh Ali Hasan's Response And Enquiry

Chapter: Are actions A Condition for the Validity (Sihhah) of Imaan or its Perfection (Kamaal)?

- Introduction
- From the Perspective of the Branches of Imaan
- In Relation to the Link Between the Heart and the Limbs
- In Relation to the One Who Lacks Any Good Deeds
- From the Perspective of the Acts of Major Kufr

Chapter: Imaan in the View of Abu Muhammad al-Yamaani

Chapter: Important Reflections

Closing Remarks

INTRODUCTION

All Praise is due to Allaah, Lord of the Worlds and prayers and peace upon Muhammad, his family and his companions. To proceed:

This is brief and concise response by Shaikh Ali Hasan al-Halabi to the recent verdict of the Permanent Committee (dated 14/6/1421H) concerning his two books related to the subjects of takfir and ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed. The main text constitutes the actual reply of Shaikh Ali Hasan and is a summarisation of the full 30-page response, which will come in due course, if Allaah wills.

This is a knowledge-based discussion with the Permanent Committee and will continue until the affair is resolved and the matter settled. As for the rejoicing of the Qutubists, then as always, it will be short-lived. However, their immediate reaction, and their taking the day of the issuing of the verdict as a day of Eid, has revealed much of what they used to hide – and all praise is due to Allaah.

And Allaah grants success...

SHAIKH ALI HASAN'S RESPONSE AND ENQUIRY

All praise is due to Allaah as He truly deserves it, and prayers and peace upon his Prophet and Slave, and upon his family, companions and delegates.

To proceed:

Before a few days ago, I had looked at the fatwaa of the venerated Permanent Committee for Verdicts (no. 21517, dated 14/6/1421H) in refutation of my two books, "at-Tahdheer min Fitnat it-Takfir" and "Saihatu Nadheer bi Khatar it-Takfir" – and warning against them!

So I reflected over the fatwaa with care and precision, studied its various angles slowly, and returned back to the quotations it cited, with scrutiny – hoping [in all of that] that some error, mistake or slip might become apparent to me and so that I may recant from it and repent to my Lord - free is He from imperfections – away from it.

And I had written a detailed reply concerning this fatwaaa and its particular orientation – the very day that I came across it – its title being, "Al-Ajwibah al-Mutalaa'imah 'Alaa Fatwaa al-Lajnah ad-Daa'imah", reaching thirty pages or so! But when I knew full well that the concerns of the people had dwindled and that their resolve in their zeal for knowledge had weakened and that they – or the majority of them – would suffice themselves by reading the titles only! – without grasping the realities therein, I saw it fit to shorten the replies and to summarise [in my answers] the various angles [that I came from] – until it reached only a third of the original, and a third is still a lot! [All of this] in order to assist the way of Truth and to facilitate the knowledge of the way that is correct. And before I begin, it is necessary that I mention a few matters:

ONE: My complete respect for the revered Permanent Committee – and my admiration for its esteemed members, who are thought of with every goodness and excellence and righteousness - if Allaah wills.

TWO: It is not one of the conditions of an esteemed person (faadil) that he is also perfect (kaamil)!! In the sense that he is correct in every single matter. Rather, "All of the sons of Adam err..." as is the case with all of the Ulamaa, "There is no one amongst us, save that he is one who [either] refutes or who is refuted."

THREE: The people of Ijtihaad are rewarded in all circumstances – whether they are correct or in error – however the problem is with the blind-followers - those who do not consider well, and likewise with the ignorant, those who do not understand... and to Allaah do we belong and to Him do we return.

FOUR: Whenever any error is found in a particular book - and it is inevitable that one will exist!! – then it ought to be given its proper estimation, and is not to be removed from its context or significance, and nor should it be made greater than its [original] size!! And alongside this is the necessity of differentiating – in both criticising and refuting when the reasons for this exist – between what is an error of composition and between what is an error in belief and manhaj!! And

Allaah – free is he from imperfections - has refused that He should perfect any book but His own.

FIVE: “Returning to the truth is an excellency, and a sign of nobility for a Muslim” – as the respected Permanent Committee said at the end of its fatwaa – and I am in perfect readiness for that – externally and internally – in whatever becomes apparent to me and appears to be correct and justified in my view...

So I say – and with Allaah lies success, and by Him is all assistance and correction:

Firstly: Concerning what occurs at the beginning of the fatwaa – quoting from some “advisors” about my two books – that “they both call to the madhhab of Irjaa’ in that actions are not a condition for the validity (sihhah) of Imaan”!

So I say: **There is not in any of my two aforementioned books any investigation into this issue – absolutely!!** But I did research into in some detail and in length in my new book, “at-Ta’reef wat-Tanbi’ah Bi Ta’selaat al-Allaamah al-Albani Fee Masaa’il il-Imaan war-Radd ‘alal-Murji’ah”³ (p.79-86). And if had not been for the fear of prolonging the affair, I would have quoted it in its entirety, so refer to it. And the summarisation of my saying therein is: That the term “Shart us-Sihhah” (Condition for the Validity [of Imaan]) and its counterpart “Shart ul-Kamaal” (Condition for the Perfection [of Imaan]) are two newly-invented terms, so they are not to be rejected – absolutely and nor are they to be accepted – absolutely – except after some investigation, clarification and removal of the generalisations⁴. And built upon this, I affirm – in this issue – certain principles:

³ Translating roughly as “A Notification Of The Foundational Principles Of Allaamah Al-Albani In The Issues Of Imaan And Refuting The Murji’ah”.

⁴ AN IMPORTANT BENEFIT

Know O Sunni, that the Ahl ul-Bid’ah of old assaulted Ahl us-Sunnah with new terms and inventions which were obscure in their meaning and by which they intended to refute Ahl us-Sunnah. And amongst the most notable of examples is their adoption of the terms such as jism (body), ‘arad (organs), jihah (direction), hadd (limit) and other such terms and making them the basis for understanding the Essence, Names and Attributes of our Mighty Lord.

Then by this sophistry, they managed to make the acceptance and rejection of these terms, the actual criterion of truth and falsehood, such that anyone who would agree with them would be upon the truth and was an agreeing Sunni and that anyone who disagreed with them was upon falsehood and an opposing Bi’diyy.

And Ahl us-Sunnah stood to expose the true realities and to uncover the scandals of Ahl ul-Bid’ah and at their forefront was the Shaikh of Islaam and Destroyer of Innovation, Imaam Ahmad – rahimahullaah -, and after him Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah. And the latter explained – rahimahullaah – that the intended meaning behind these terms is to be investigated and if it is in conformity with the truth, then it is accepted with its Sharee’ah terminology, and if it a false meaning is intended by these terms then it is rejected – however, these terms should be avoided in the first place and speaking with them – and making them the criterion of truth and falsehood – is but an innovation – worthy of being avoided. For a detailed treatment of this affair and its particular details, refer to our book **‘The Mountains of Knowledge’** (pp.100-145, Salafi Publications, 1997 1st edition), in the chapter: “The Creed of Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah”.

- a) Imaan consists of speech, action and belief, it increases with acts of obedience and decreases with acts of disobedience and sin. This the foundation of the principles of Ahl us-Sunnah in this important issue, which has been opposed by the extremism of the Khawarij and which has been negated by the liberty of the Murji'ah.
- b) **“The outward actions are from the obligatory requirement of the Imaan of the heart and they are necessarily required by it, and they [the actions] constitute an affirmation (tasdeeq) of what is in the heart, giving evidence (daleel) to it, being a witness (shaahid) over it. And they [the actions] constitute a branch from the totality of Absolute Imaan, forming a part of it. However, whatever is in the heart is the foundation (asl) of what emanates from the limbs...”** as has been stated by Shaikh ul-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah – rahimahullaah – in Majmoo ul-Fataawaa (7/644). And the term “Absolute Imaan” (al-Imaan al-Mutlaq) is well-known to the people of knowledge, it is not hidden.
- c) The fruits of this term “Shart us-Sihhah” (Condition for the Validity [of Imaan]) – when it relates to the presence or absence of Takfir – in my view, is exactly what has been said by Shaikh ul-Islam Muhammad bin Abdul-Wahhaab – rahimahullaah – as occurs in ad-Durar as-Sunniyyah (1/70), “The five pillars of Islam. The first of them [by which he disbelieves] is the two testimonies of faith. And then the remaining four pillars. **However, if he affirms their obligation but abandons them out of neglect, then even though we fight him in order to make him act upon them, we do not declare him a disbeliever by mere abandonment of them.** The scholars have differed about the disbelief of the one who abandoned the prayer out of laziness, without wilful denial, juhood. **So we do not perform takfir on account of anything except what the all of the scholars are united upon, and that is the two testimonies of faith.”**

This is what I say and what I believe, **being far-removed from general terms, shunning the newly invented and obscure words**⁵. So where is that claim (that is supposed to exist in my

And then you should come to realise that the Qutubiyyah of today – who use the verdicts of our Scholars - have trodden the same path in their assault to accuse their opponents of the blameworthy Irjaa', making the criterion of truth the acceptance or rejection of these terms and their imports – which contain both generalised and particular meanings, and by which both truth and falsehood can be intended. And the way of Ahl us-Sunnah wal-Jamaa'ah, Muhadditheen and Fuqahaa is the way of research and investigation and clarification – following in all of that – the Imaams of the Sunnah before them. For a full treatment of this affair refer to **Chapter : Are Actions A Condition for the Validity of Imaan or its Perfection?**

And as for occurs in the text of the verdict of the Committee (and which is originally from the words of the “advisors” to the committee) concerning “shart us-sihhah” then the intent is to establish that actions are from Imaan – and this is correct and there is no contention concerning this - however, the intent of Shaikh Ali Hasan is to illustrate the significance of the term “shart us-sihhah” to the actual judgement of takfir upon a Muslim, and for a detailed treatment of this matter refer to the abovementioned discussion at the end of this discourse.

⁵ And in doing so the Shaikh has trodden the path of those before him such as Imaam Ahmad and Shaikh ul-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah, as well as those with him such as Imaam Ibn Baaz and Shaikh Ibn Uthameen.

The Shaikh also stated that which supports the above, “And we believe that the believer who is perfect in his Imaan – is the one who performs the righteous actions and avoids the sinful actions – [and this is]

book)?! And what is the proof that I used for it? And what is its true meaning and what is truly intended by it?!

Secondly: Concerning what the respected Permanent Committee attributed to me that I “...restrict kufr to the kufr of juhood (denial), takdheeb (rejection) and istihlaal (making the unlawful lawful)” and that this is “the madhhab of the Murji’ah” - !!! referencing that to at-Tahdheer, page 6 footnote 2 and page 22!

So I say: As for the first place (page 6 footnote 2), then whatever is in the body of the text then it is the words of the Shaikh and Allaamah, Abdul-Lateef bin Abdur-Rahmaan bin Hasan Aal ash-Shaikh in the division of kufr into “the kufr of action and the kufr of juhood (denial)...” and there is nothing from my words in any of that!! As for the footnote, then it consists of pure knowledge-based quotations from Ibn Hazm, Ibn al-Qayyim and adh-Dhahabi only. And there is nothing from my words in any of that either! **Further, I had actually alluded – at this place – to the words of Shaikh ul-Islaam – rahimahullaah – in which there is a praise of the words of Ibn Hazm concerning the issue of Irjaa’, and his (i.e. Shaikh ul-Islaam’s) agreement with it!**⁶

So where is the place that warrants criticism, and what is the point of criticism and disapproval?!

As for the [text] at the second place (page 22) then it is but the statement of Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah – rahimahullaah – from Majmoo ul-Fataawaa (20/90) in which there occurs his quotation about Ahl us-Sunnah that “...**they do not expel anyone from Islaam by an action... so long as it does not comprise the abandonment of Imaan...**” and there also occurs therein, “...**Similarly, a person becomes a disbeliever by not having belief (I’tiqaad) in the obligation of the outward obligatory duties that have been successively reported (mutawaatir) or [by] not holding to be unlawful the outward forbidden actions that have been successively reported...**”.

implied in the correct and true principles [contained] in the understanding of an expression that has become widespread, and that is “condition of validity” or “condition of perfection” (“shart us-sihhah” or “shart ul-kamaal”) and this is but a terminological phrase, it is not permissible to deny it or to negate it, except after seeking clarification from the one who speaks with it: So if he means (by perfection, kamaal) that actions are not from Imaan, **then it is extremely false and extreme misguidance...**

And if he means the perfection (kamaal) that exists in accordance to the extent that righteous actions exist – **tied to Imaan – whether in abundance or very little** – in the sense that it can increase such that it reaches the peak (of a mountain) and that it can decrease such that nothing remains from it except the weight of an atom, **then we explain that this is the correct meaning but the wording is not correct.** Especially since the usage of the word “shart” (condition) in the view of the grammarians means “being external to the essence of a thing”, and this is extremely futile, since actions are actually from the reality of Imaan and its essence.

And this is how we behave with all of the various terminologies – in both negation and affirmation – as has been affirmed by our most notable Scholars, such as Shaikh ul-Islaam.” (Ar-Radd al-Ilmee al-Mateen ‘alaa Ihsaan Wa Man Ma’ahu Minal-Mukhaalifeen” (p.5-6) 26th July 2000)

⁶ And it is known that of the best and most powerful of refutations of Irjaa’ in history is that of Ibn Hazm, ‘al-Fisal’ – who demolished the scandals of the Jahmiyyah and other than them amongst the Innovating Heretics!!

So I added a note to this saying, **“The matter therefore – concerning kufr – is built around the negation of Eemaan (naqd ul-Imaan) and the absence of belief (I’tiqaad)”**?! So where then is this restriction?! And where exactly is the point of criticism?! And my comment is nothing but a mere repetition of the exact same that was mentioned by Shaikh ul-Islam!! And then, does not the phrase “...the negation of Imaan (naqd ul-Imaan)...” allude to all of the various types of matters that negate it, and the various categories of this negation, in their generality?!

And I had quoted in at-Tahdheer (page 11) from the Salafi Allaamah, Shaikh Abdur-Rahmaan bin Naasir as-Sa’ddee – rahimahullaah – his defining of kufr, with all its types and categories with “...denial and rejection (jahd) of what the Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) came with, or denial and rejection of some of it...” and then I added my own note to this saying, **“And this does not negate the consideration of the types of kufr to be six as has been mentioned in some of the books of the Salafi Aqidah...”**

And I repeated this in “al-Fihris” (page 160) – laying down a principle – with my saying, **“There is no contradiction between juhood (denial) being the route to kufr and between considering the types of kufr to be six in number.”** So where is the restriction?!

As for what occurs in my book Saihatu Nadheer, then I quoted (on pages 47-48) from Imaam Ibn al-Qayyim from al-Madaarij (1/337) his explanation of the various types of kufr – **all of them, in detail** – where is this restriction in this?! And then I added to all of that, explaining – by the success of Allaah in numerous places in my book at-Ta’reef wat-Tanbi’ah (such as on pages 62, 63-64, 67-68) and from that was what I said on page 64 that **“Mentioning something in isolation, without [mentioning] what is other than it, does not necessitate denying what is other than it”**⁷. Rather, this occurs from the point of view of [giving consideration] to what is predominant and overwhelming.” And I also said on page 67 of this book, **“And just as Imaan is speech, action and belief then similar to it is its opposite – which is kufr – which consists of speech, action and belief...”**

And this is the exact same expression used by the respected Permanent Committee in this particular verdict (under discussion) - all praise is due to Allaah. So where then is the restriction?! **And I also make a reminder here** – at this point – of the verdict that the respected Committee

⁷ And to illustrate this important principle from the words of the People of Knowledge: Shaikh ul-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah said, **“The basis (asl) of kufr is rejection (inkaar) of Allaah.”** (Majmoo ul-Fataawaa 3/345). Ibn al-Qayyim said, **“Certainly, kufr is juhood (denial)”** (Akhaam Ahl udh-Dhimmah 3/1156). And likewise Imaam as-Sa’ddee said, “The apostate, murtad, is the one who exits from Islaam and enters into disbelief on account of an action, statement, a belief or doubt. **And the Scholars - may Allaah have mercy upon them - have mentioned the specific detail and explanation of the matters by which a servant leaves Islaam. And all of them have their basis in the rejection, jahd, of what the Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) came with, or rejection, jahd, of some of it.**” (Manhaj us-Saalikeen p.112).

So do we say that, “Ibn Taymiyyah has restricted kufr to rejection of Allaah” and “Ibn al-Qayyim has restricted kufr to Juhood only” and “Imaam as-Sa’ddee has restricted kufr to Juhood absolutely”? Or do we say that these are general statements that are not to be taken absolutely and hence it is necessary to refer back to the decisive and clear statements that explain these statements? And that these statements do not negate the explanation of kufr with its various other types in the other works or statements of these same scholars?!

made two years ago in refuting the author of the book “Ihkaam ut-Taqreer” – may Allaah guide him – concerning what he mentioned in his book of the restriction of kufr to takdheeb (rejection) and juhood (denial)!! And that I had written at that time – in assistance and support of the respected Committee – and that I distributed (what I had written)⁸ – indicating all of that at that time, while here I make a reminder that the authoring of my book Saihatu Nadheer took place **one and half years before the fatwaa of the Committee (concerning the book “Ihkaam ut-Taqreer”)** !! So where then is the restriction?! And how was it made?!

Thirdly: Concerning what the respected Committee – may Allaah straighten its affairs – attributed to me of distorting a quotation from the Imaam, Ibn Katheer in his text about the claim of Jenghis Khan about al-Yaasaq (his constitution), that it was from Allaah! And they mentioned the text which they attributed to me – the wording of which was, “... that Jenghis Khan claimed that al-Yaasaq was from Allaah and that this was the reason for their disbelief”!!⁹ And they referred back to the reference that I mentioned and they did not find the “text” present!!

I say – and from Allaah is all aid sought, and in Him is all trust placed: This particular matter was investigated by me in my book at-Tahdheer (pages 14-15 of the 2nd edition, and page 13 of the 1st edition) and yet **in neither of them does there exist any text that is referenced back to Ibn Katheer in his al-Bidaayah concerning the so called claim, absolutely!!** Yes, in both editions of at-Tahdheer, I conveyed the general import of a text in al-Bidaayah but without even mentioning a single word of it!! So where is this distortion (tahreef) of the text?! Rather, where is the quotation (in my book) to begin with, such that it can be claimed that there is a distortion in it? Yes, I mentioned the text **with its actual wording** in my book Saihatu Nadheer (p73) and this text is not as they attributed to me (in my first book at-Tahdheer) at all! And the text (quoted in Saihatu Nadheer) is the actual text that is found, word for word, in al-Bidaayah, and it is referenced to this particular source, quoted directly from it. And at the end of which there occurs that Jenghis Khan, “...would ascend a mountain, then descend, then ascend again, then descend – numerous times – until he became overtaken by tiredness and stupor (insensibility) **and then he would command those who were around him to write down what would be revealed upon his tongue (yulqaa ‘alaa lisaanihi).**”!!

And I had also quoted prior to this on page 71 a quote from Shaikh ul-Islaam from one of the chiefs of the Tartars who said, **“These two great signs (aayataan adheemataan) came from Allaah, Muhammad and Genghis Khan”!**

⁸ Shaikh Ali Hasan had written an open communication to propagate his breaking off from the author of “Ihkaam ut-Taqir” and spread it in the magazines and other than that to show his freedom and to make his stance abundantly clear on the issue. However, we still await the Lords of Adulterated Principles to spread an open communication containing their repentance from their calling to the madhhab of the Khawarij by performing takfir of the sinners, and also their repentance from propagating the books of the Innovators and Rafidee Heretics and turning them into Imaams of the Sunnah, and also their repentance for the repugnant innovation of ‘al-Muwaazanah’, and also from their loyalty to Ahl ul-Bid’ah, and also their repentance from their belittlement and mockery of the Senior Ulamaa, and also their repentance for innovating into the matter of Tawheed. To this day, nothing...

⁹ **NOTE:** This particular text as it is quoted does not exist in the book of Shaikh Ali at all, and neither was this text attributed to Ibn Kathir and his ‘al-Bidaayah’!!

And Ibn Katheer had also quoted after the text mentioned previously from him (in al-Bidaayah) something from al-Juwainee concerning the Tartars what supports this!¹⁰ So can there be found anything that is clearer than this in claiming (that it is revelation from Allaah). Then I added a note to this quotation thereafter to explain my intent, and so that my purpose may become clear.¹¹

Fourthly: Concerning what the respected Committee attributed to me – may Allaah straighten its affair – of “...forging a lie against Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah, that the replaced law (al-Hukm al-Mubaddal) is not kufr unless it occurs due to ma’rifah (knowledge), i’tiqaad (belief) and istihlaal (making the unlawful lawful)...”! And they referenced this (fabrication) to at-Tahdheer (page 17-18)!!

So I say: In this particular place are two quotations from Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah, the first of them from Majmoo ul-Fataawaa (3/267) when he – rahimahullaah – mentions the state of the one who “replaced the Sharee’ah (baddala ash-Shar’) - that [from it] which is agreed upon” and he – rahimahullaah – carries this to refer to the **“one who declares it to be lawful (huwal-mustahillu) to rule by other than what Allah has revealed”** which is its actual text.¹²

¹⁰ And that is the saying of Ibn Katheer, “And al-Juwainee has mentioned that one of their worshippers (from the Tartars) would ascend the mountain in the extreme cold for the purpose of worship, and then he would hear someone saying to him, “Verily, we have given Jenghis Khan and his offspring authority upon the Earth”. Al-Juwainee said, “So the Mashaayikh of al-Mighwal would believe in this and consider it to be incontrovertible (i.e. uncontested)”.” (al-Bidaayah 13/117-118)

¹¹ And the note added by Shaikh Ali Hasan to what was quoted from al-Juwainee by Ibn Katheer was, “And this is from their perfect fabrication – based upon his (i.e. Jenghis Khan) lie – that it would “thrown upon (i.e. revealed upon) him”, meaning inspired to him.” Refer to Part 1 of this series to see more quotations on the reality of Jenghis Khan and his followers.

¹² And this is the full quote from Shaikh ul-Islaam (3/267 of Majmoo ul-Fataawaa): “And when a person declares a unanimously agreed unlawful matter to be lawful or a unanimously agreed lawful matter to be unlawful or replaced the Sharee’ah (baddala ash-Shar’) - that [from it] which is agreed upon - he is a kaafir, an apostate by agreement of the jurists. And it is with regards to the likes of this that the following (verse) was revealed, according to one of two opinions: **And whoever does not rule by what Allah has revealed then they are the disbelievers (Maa’idah 5:44)** meaning that **he declares it to be permissible (huwal-mustahillu) to rule by other than what Allah has revealed.**”

And Shaikh Ali Hasan had also quoted from Ibn al-Qayyim (at-Tahdheer page 14) his saying: “And as for the replaced law (al-hukm al-mubaddal) - **and that is ruling by other than what allaah has revealed** - then it is not permissible to implement it nor to act by it. It is not permissible to follow it, **and the one guilty of it is between (the states) of kufr (disbelief), fusooq (rebellion) and dhulm (oppression).**” Kitaab ur-Rooh (p.655).

And as for what occurs in the verdict of the Permanent Committee, in point no. 3:

“His forgery upon Shaikh -ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyah - may Allah have mercy upon him - on pages 17-18 when the aforementioned compiler of the book, attributed to him that the ruling upon the replaced law (al-Hukm al-Mubaddal) according to Shaikh al-Islaam is not kufr (akbar) except when it takes place with Marifah (knowledge), I’tiqaad (belief) and Istihlaal (making the unlawful lawful), and this is a pure forgery attributed to Shaikhul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyah - may Allah have Mercy upon him - as he was the propagator of the madhhab of the Salaf, Ahlus-Sunnah wal-Jamaaah, and their Madhhab is what has preceded, **whereas this indeed is the Madhhab of the Murji’ah.**”

Know O seeker of truth, that this is indeed other than the truth – may Allaah straighten the affairs of our respected Mashayikh – and never is this the madhhab of the Murji'ah ever, and we call Imaam al-Albani to witness over this and we call Imaam Ibn Baz to witness over this and we call the previous Permanent Committee to witness over this, let alone the scores of other Mashaayikh who would differ with the Permanent Committee. Rather it is but the madhhab of Ahl us-Sunnah embodied and is indeed what is indicated in the words of Shaikh ul-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah quoted above.

Imaam Ibn Baaz was asked, "Is replacement (of the Shari'ah) with the secular laws (tabdeel ul-qawaaneen) considered to be major kufr that expels from the religion?". He replied, **"When he makes it permissible (istibaaha). When he makes it permissible (istibaaha) to judge with a law other than the Shari'ah he becomes a disbeliever with the major kufr – if he makes that permissible..."** Ibn Baz then quoted the verse in al-Ma'idah (5:44) and then proceeded to quote the tafseer of Ibn Abbaas, "kufr doona kufr". Then the questioner said, **"Is there a difference between replacement (tabdeel) and between ruling in a particular issue? ... Tabdeel O Shaikh?"** To which the Shaikh replied, "This (i.e. the above explanation) covers all of the manifestations, in all of the manifestations...". Refer to the book, "Hiwaar Hawla Masaa'il it-Takfeer Ma'a Allaamah ash-Shaikh Abdul-Azeez Ibn Baaz" and it is found also in al-Furqaan Magazine (no. 94)

And refer also to the well-know and distributed cassette entitled 'al-Dam'ah al-Baaziyyah' which is a knowledge based meeting between Imaam Ibn Baaz and a gathering of teachers from the Imaam Muhammad bin Sa'ood University in Riyadh, in the Faculty of Sunnah and the Fundamentals of the Religion in which the issue of tabdeel and istibdaal (replacing the Sharee'ah with secular law) is discussed in detail – with Imaam Ibn Baaz being – as if it were – assaulted by those around him – of the people of knowledge – like in a siege – and they were trying to establish that ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed warrants takfir absolutely. Yet the Imaam stood his ground and stated that even if a ruler fell into tabdeel, or instituted secular laws, he does not become a disbeliever except by way of Istihlaal, or if he attributes these laws to the Sharee'ah. And the noble brother, Doctor Abu Abdul-Malik Hamad ash-Shatawee – has made references to this gathering in his book "Al-Ibreeziyyah Fit-Tis'een al-Baaziyyah" in numerous places and amongst them is his saying on page 55, **"The people - consisting of a large and respected group from the people of knowledge and excellence - used to contest him greatly concerning it (i.e. the fatwa), and it seemed as if it was a siege against him, in the issue of the unrestricted and absolute takfir of the individual who rules by other than what Allaah has revealed. Yet he was defiant in adhering to the madhhab of the Salaf, and took a very harsh stance towards the one who opposed this. He would also emphasise that takfir cannot be performed merely on account of disobedience or sin, so long as the person does not openly and clearly declare the act to be lawful, as a matter of belief. And he would say, 'Whatever is in opposition to this is the madhhab of the Innovators, the Khawaarij.'"**

And there is also the previous verdict of the Permanent Committee (signed by Imaam Ibn Baaz, and Shaikh Abdullaah bin Ghudayaan and Abdullaah bin Qu'ood) in response to the question, "...what is the ruling upon the one who refers judgement to (yatahaakama) the secular laws (al-qawaaneen al-wad'iyyah) while he knows of their futility, yet he does not fight against these laws and nor does he work to end these laws...?"

The reply of the Permanent Committee: "...Judging (at-Tahaakum) is to Allaah the Most High and to the Sunnah of the Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam). **So if he does not judge to them both (yatahaakam ilaihimaa), whilst making it lawful to judge to other than them (mustahillan it-Tahaakuma ilaa ghayrihimaa) amongst the secular laws (al-qawaaneen al-wad'iyyah) with the hope of deriving some material benefit or for the sake of honour or for seeking a better position then he is one who is sinful (murtakibu ma'siyyatin) and is a sinner, faasiq, with the lesser fisq with does not expel him from Imaan.."** Refer to Fataawaa Lajnah ad-Daaimah of Shaikh Ahmad bin Abdur-Razzaq ad-Dawaish 1/540-541, Question 3 of Fatwaa No. 6310.

And also the following fatwa:

Question. The one who does not judge by what Allaah has revealed, is he a Muslim or a Kafir [guilty of] the major kufr and are his actions accepted?

Answer. All Praise is due to Allaah and prayers and peace upon the His Messenger, his family and his companions. To proceed: Allaah the Most High said: **"And whosoever does not judge by what Allāh**

As for the second of the two texts (I quoted) then it is from Minhaaj us-Sunnah (5/131) in which there is some statements about "...the one who **does not believe (i'taqada)** in the obligation to judge by what Allaah has revealed upon His Messenger..." and that "...**the one who declares it permissible (istihalla)** to judge amongst the people with what he considers to be justice, as opposed to following what Allaah has revealed, then he is a disbeliever..." and also his saying about them that "...**So if they know ('arafoo)** that it is not permissible to judge except by what Allaah has revealed and did not adhere to that, but in fact **declared it to be lawful (istahalloo)** for themselves to judge in opposition to what Allaah has revealed, then they are disbelievers. **And if not [i.e. did not declare it lawful for themselves] then they are [merely] ignorant people** – as has preceded about them."¹³

So what then can be understood from these texts?! And where is this fabrication against Shaikh ul-Islaam in my notes¹⁴ to his statements?! Rather, they are nothing but a summarisation of what

has revealed, such are the **Kāfirūn**" (5:44), and He the Most High said, "**And whosoever does not judge by that which Allāh has revealed, such are the Zālimūn**" (5:45) and He the Most High said, "**And whosoever does not judge by what Allāh has revealed (then) such (people) are the Fāsiqūn**" (5:47).

However if he declares that to be lawful (istahalla dhalik) and believes it to be permissible (i'taqadahu jaa'izan), then this is the major kufr, the major fisq and the major dhulm which expels him from the religion. However, if he did this due to a bribe or some other motive while believing in the forbiddance [of this act], then he is considered a disbeliever with the minor kufr, a dhalim with the minor dhulm and a fasiq with the minor fisq which does not expel him from the religion – as the people of knowledge have explained in the exegesis (tafsir) of the aforementioned verses."

The Permanent Committee for Research and Verdicts: **Member:** Abdullah bin Ghudayan **Deputy Head:** Abdur-Razzaq Afifi **Head:** Abdul-Azeez bin Baz.

Refer to "Fataawaa of the Permanent Committee for Research and Verdicts", compiled by Shaikh Ahmad bin `Abdur-Razzaq ad-Duwaish, Volume 1 (Aqidah), Question No. 11 of Fatwa No.5741.

So understand and know this well O seeker of truth, may Allaah increase you in goodness and guide you to what is correct...

¹³ And the full text of the quote is, "**There is no doubt that the one who does not believe (i'taqada) in the obligation to rule by what Allaah has revealed is a disbeliever. Hence, whoever declares it permissible (istahalla) to judge amongst the people with what he considers to be justice, without following what Allaah has revealed, then he is a disbeliever. There is no nation except that it orders ruling with justice. And sometimes justice, as perceived by its senior leaders, can exist in its religion. Many of those who ascribe themselves to Islaam judge by their customs that Allaah has not revealed, such as the ancestral customs of the bedouins. And the chiefs (umaraa) were obeyed (in this) and they used to consider that it is desirable to judge by these such customs, without the Book and the Sunnah. And this is disbelief.** For many people have accepted Islaam but along with this they do not judge except by their natural [inherited] customs, those which are ordered by those whom they obey. **So if they know ('arafoo) that it is not permissible to judge except by what Allaah has revealed and did not adhere to that, but in fact declared it to be lawful (istahalloo) for themselves to judge in opposition to what Allaah has revealed, then they are disbelievers. And if not [i.e. did not declare it lawful for themselves] then they are [merely] ignorant people** – as has preceded about them" Minhaaj us-Sunnah (5/130)

¹⁴ Shaikh Ali Hasan added the following note: "And his words - may Allaah have mercy upon him - are clear and explicit in that he bases the ruling (of disbelief) upon **acquaintance (ma'rifah), belief (i'tiqaad) and then declaring it to be lawful (istihlaal)** and that the absence of this does not necessitate disbelief, for (then) its doer is an ignorant person, not a disbeliever. So when some of them see this statement - such as the thinker, the activist, Mohammad Qutb in 'Waaqi'unaa al-Mu'aasir' (p.330) and some of his students!!

he said and exacting the various principles contained in them?! And alongside this, I request from the respected Mashaayikh – may Allaah straighten their affair – to bring out and to write a very precise knowledge based expression which is derived from these words of Shaikh ul-Islaam in the definition of kufr and in definition of the reality of tabdeel and ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed! So that I can take this from them and quote it directly from them... and if not then where is the fabrication?! When my words are but his words?!

Fifthly: Concerning what the noble Committee attributed to me of "... distorting the intent the respected Allaamah, Shaikh Muhammad bin Ibraaheem Aal ash-Shaikh – rahimahullaah – in his booklet "Tahkeem ul-Qawaaneen", and that I claimed that the Shaikh specified the condition of Istihlaal Qalbi (making something lawful with ones heart, i.e. as a matter of belief)..""!!!

So I say: I had researched in detail – with quotations – the saying of the respected Shaikh, Muhammad bin Ibraaheem – rahimahullaah – in at-Tahdheer (p.25-26) and there does not exist in there – absolutely – what the Committee have attributed to me of mentioning the condition of "Istihlaal Qalbi""!!! Yes, I quoted numerous sayings from the respected Shaikh – rahimahullaah – in which there **occurs the textual specification of the condition of having i'tiqaad (belief) in the correctness of ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed (of the secular laws) and deeming it permissible (jawaaz) for the takfir of a person who falls into this.** So if there is to be any debate or any form of criticism **then it ought to be directed to the Shaikh – rahimahullaah – and not to the one who merely quoted it!** And what I had said, in at-Tahdheer (page 27) was as follows:

"And he - may Allaah have mercy upon him - has also brought this matter to light in the most perfect of ways in 'Majmoo ul-Fataawaa' (1/80) - with very clear and precise words whilst mentioning the man-made secular laws, that oppose the Sharee'ah and for which Allaah sent down no authority, so he said: **"...the one who judges by them (hakama bihaa) or refers to them (haakama ilaihaa) - for judgement whilst believing in the correctness (sihha) of that or the permissibility (to judge by them) (jawaaz), then he is a kaafir with the kufr that ejects from the religion. And if he does that without belief (i'tiqaad) in their correctness and (regarding it) permissible to judge by them (jawaaz), then he is a kaafir with the kufr in action, which does not eject from the religion."**

And I also make notification of the fact, here, that this particular fatwaa was issued by the respected Shaikh – rahimahullaah – **after his booklet "Takheem ul-Qawaaneen" by a period of five years!** So where then is the distortion (I am supposed to have made), let alone any confusion, in a clearly written quotation "...that is as clear as the daylight sun?"

And then I made further investigation – and made the affair clear – in affirming the viewpoint of the respected Shaikh, Muhammad bin Ibraaheem – rahimahullaah – in Saihatu Nadheer (pges 96-99) and more recently in at-Ta'reef wat-Tanbi'ah (pages 70-76), quoting from our respected

- They remove from the quotation (those words) which make it clear and explicit, and that is his saying - may Allaah have mercy upon him - at the end of it: **"... and if not (i.e. declare it to be lawful as a matter of belief) then they are merely ignorant"**, so what shall we say!!"

And it was also this particular footnote of Shaikh Ali Hasan that set Abu Ruhayyim's clothes on fire - when he described Mohammad Qutb as "the thinker, the activist""!!!

Teacher and Father, the Allaamah and Shaikh, Abdul-Azeez Ibn Baaz – rahimatullaahi alaihi – what supports this particular choice (of mine) and what actually affirms and establishes it – without the least of difficulties – and from whatever aspect.

Sixthly: Concerning what the revered Committee attributed to me – may Allaah straighten its affair – about “... **commenting upon the words** of those that he mentioned from the people of knowledge by imposing meanings upon their statements which they do not contain”! And they mentioned in this regard three places in my book at-Tahdheer:

- a) As for the first – from what they mentioned – then it is on page 108 footnote 1!! **And there is not a single word from my writing, and not any writing from my words on the page!!** Rather, it is a mere quotation from our esteemed Teacher Shaikh, Allaamah Muhammad bin Saalih al-Uthaimeen – may Allaah protect and pardon him and bring firmness to Ahl us-Sunnah through him - in both the main text and the footnote together, and is nothing (but that)... So where is my comment upon it, and where is the misinterpretation?!
- b) As for the second – from what they mentioned – then it is on page 109 footnotes 1 and 2 then that is yet another text also from our esteemed Shaikh, Allaamah Muhammad bin Saalih al-Uthaimeen – may Allaah strengthen him – concerning the ruling upon “the one who ruled by other than what Allaah has revealed – in replacement of the deen (religion) of Allaah...” and concerning this, is his own statement, “... **so this is major kufr that expels from the religion, because such a one made himself a legislator along with Allaah – the Mighty and Majestic - and because he hates the Sharee’ah.**” So none of this is from my words, originally, fundamentally! And as for the footnote then it is my saying, “And this particular condition (i.e. that of hatred of the Sharee’ah) cannot be realised except by way of belief (i’tiqaad), or juhood (denial) and what resembles them both, or gives evidence to them, with certainty and without any doubt or suspicion that enters upon (this certainty) – and if not then is disbelief and apostasy – which are both based upon hatred (in this case) - known by mere outward opposition and mere abandonment?!”¹⁵ So where then is the misinterpretation, whereas it is in fact a mere summary of the very words of the Shaikh himself, without any addition or increase! And

¹⁵ And in fact what supports this is the saying of Shaikh Ibn Uthaimeen himself, in his Fataawaa (2/145):

“And ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed is of two types:

The first type: **that the ruler replaces (yastabdilu) the law of Allaah the Exalted by this law** whilst he has knowledge of the law of Allaah **but he holds that the opposing law is more befitting and more beneficial for the servants than the rule of Allaah or that it is equal to the law of Allaah or that turning away from the law of Allaah is permissible (jaa’iz)** - so therefore, he makes this law (qaanoon) **the one that it is obligatory to refer back to for judgement (yajib at-Tahaakum ilaihi)** - **so the likes of this one is a kaafir with the kufr that ejects from the religion and that is because he is not pleased with Allaah as his Lord, Muhammad as his Messenger and Islaam as his religion...**” End of quote.

And hence such a one dislikes Allaah as his Lord, Muhammad as his Messenger and Islaam as his religion!! And tied to all of this is his belief that the opposing law is more befitting and more beneficial or equal to the law of Allaah and that turning away from the law of Allaah is permissible – and so he makes it obligatory to refer back to this law!!

alongside this, I request my respected Mashaayikh – may Allaah straighten their affair – to bring out an expression – more exact than my expression – in conveying the meaning and import of the words of the respected Shaikh – may Allaah strengthen him, such that I can adopt it and direct others to it...

- c) As for the third – from what they mentioned – then it is on page 110 footnote 2!! And there does not even exist in the text – at this place – except the saying of the esteemed Shaikh, Muhammad bin Saalih al-Uthaimeen – may Allaah expand and prolong his duration – in refutation of the “...**doubt (shubhah) with many of the youth, which has become firmly and deeply rooted in their minds and it has kindled the issue of revolting against the rulers...**” – and then the respected Shaikh mentioned what this doubt was, explained it and refuted it. And as for my comment, then it contains nothing but agreement with the words of the Shaikh, a praise of them and support of them, without any other addition or any further explanation or clarification!! So where then is the misinterpretation?! Where is the misinterpretation?!

Seventhly: Concerning what the noble Committee ascribed to me – may Allaah strengthen it with success – of “...showing insignificance to ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed with the claim that being concerned with the realisation Tawheed in this issue contains resemblance to the Shi’ah or the Rafidah” and then referencing that to page 5 footnote 1 of at-Tahdheer! So I say – and by my Lord, free is he from imperfections – do I rise:

Firstly: There does not even exist in my words the sentence “the realisation of Tawheed” absolutely! Rather, my words revolve around the callers of “al-Haakimiyyah” (the one) that has a representation in opposition to the manhaj of the Salaf! So I said, commenting upon the word “al-Hukm” (ruling) which occurs in the main text:

“And (there is) one who gives it the name ‘al-Haakimiyyah’ - **and this is a new usage - which requires investigation and insight!** Then he makes it the most important foundation of the religion! And the greatest aspect of the religion!! So that when aqeedah is mentioned to him, he carries it to mean ‘al-Haakimiyyah’ and when he (himself) mentions aqeedah, then it is to him - a single word - ‘al-Haakimiyyah’!! **And to a number of the people of knowledge, this resembles the beliefs of the abominable shee’ah - those who have made the imaamah the greatest foundation of the religion!!** And this is a false saying and a baseless, empty opinion. Shaikh ul-Islaam - may Allaah have mercy upon him - the Imaam Ibn Taymiyyah has refuted it against them with strength [of argumentation] in ‘Minhaaj us-Sunnah’ (1/20-29) so refer to that.” (page 5 of at-Tahdheer).

I say: Indeed, I quoted also (in Saihatu Nadheer) a very important fatwaa of the Permanent Committee no. 18870 in refutation of the very same people that I am refuting (here). And in this fatwaa there occurs their saying – may Allaah bring about benefit through their knowledge – “**And making al-Haakimiyyah a separate and independent category from the categories of Tawheed is a newly-invented matter, none of the Scholars have spoken with it – as far as we know.**” So can someone then say, “that the respected Committee shows insignificance to ruling by other than

what Allaah has revealed, rather it denies that it is actually from Tawheed, let alone that there should be the realisation of Tawheed (included) in this affair – with the argument that it (al-Haakimiyyah) is not from the types of Tawheed?! And this is the most futile of falsehood!

And I explained the issue of the usage of the term al-Haakimiyyah, and what it can compromise of truth and error, in my book Saihatu Nadheer (pages 80-95), in detail, quoting therein from Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah – rahimahullaah – six quotations in refutation of the one who “...made the issue of Imaamah (leadership), the greatest of the goals in the religious rulings, and the most noble issues pertaining to the (affairs of the) Muslims” and that this is “a lie by unanimous agreement of the Muslims – both the Sunnis and the Shi’ah – rather it is disbelief (kufr)...” as is the actual wording of the quote from him – rahimahullaah.

And is al-Haakimiyyah with these people anything but this?¹⁶

And I had quoted on page 84 of Saihatu Nadheer what actually strengthens my words - and the previous fatwaa of the Permanent Committee as well – from the words of the respected Doctor, Naasir ud-Deen ‘Abdullaah al-Qifaaree – may Allaah grant him success – and that is his saying, **“I consider that Tawheed ul-Haakimiyyah in the view of those who have made it a fourth and separate category of Tawheed – or [at least] with some of them – is actually linked with the issue of Imaamah (leadership) and not with the issue of Tawheed [itself]!”** And this (meaning) is the very same matter that I am pointing out, and which I intend. And also the very many other statements that I included (in the book) amongst them my saying on pages 86-87, which are clear, manifest and clear-cut, “Al-Haakimiyyah with its correct and comprehensive Sharee’ah meaning – which is based upon His – the Most High’s – saying, **“The judgement belongs to none but Allaah, He has commanded that you worship none but Him alone”, is a very important principle of the religion, and obligatory precept of the Sharee’ah.**”

So where then is this insignificance (that I have shown)?!

Secondly: The actual basis of the comment – in the text – and on the very first page of the book, was made by quoting the statement of Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen in which he describes this issue of ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed as “...of the

¹⁶ Know O Muslim, that the callers to al-Haakimiyyah are in fact callers to the Imaamah (leadership) for these two are both synonymous with each other. Can it be conceived that the Haakimiyyah of Allaah be established (as they say) without the existence of an Imaam to oversee the rule of Allaah and His Judgement? So their greatest goal is to bring about a Jamaa’ah of the Muslims (comprising of both the Sunni and the Bid’iyy) and then to appoint an Imaam over them (and amongst themselves they all vie for this – to gain the thrones of power) – and hence, their great fascination with issues of rule and rulership. This is what has led them to make the starting point of their call something other than the starting point of the Messengers. And the Noble Shaikh, Rabee’ bin Haadee has exposed their innermost secrets in the book that is a thorn in the throat of every Innovator, “The Methodology of the Prophets in Calling to Allaah” – and he has addressed the issue of al-Haakimiyyah and al-Imaamah (Leadership) in his refutation of Mawdoodi, who expounded these ideas – so refer to it.

greatest of matters by which the rulers of this time have been put to trial...". So can anyone who shows insignificance to this affair say the likes of these words?!

Thirdly: In fact, I quoted – in clear and manifest Arabic words – in at-Tahdheer, pages 30-31, after some investigation and other words, **"And we do not say this in belittlement of the issue of ruling by what Allaah has revealed, or reducing the importance of the application of the Sharee'ah [laws]. We do not conceive of this, nor do we call to it and neither are we eager for it... And how can we belittle a great and repulsive matter (i.e. the sin) for which the ruling – and for the one who is guilty of it – revolves around kufr, dhulm or fisq?!"**

So where is this (so-called) insignificance?! Where is this insignificance?! Unless it has been understood from my words – due to specific reason or another! – that adopting tafseel (clarification, distinction) in the issue of ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed – in either action or in belief – and my giving preference to the absence of takfir absolutely – that this necessitates insignificance (to this issue)!!! This can never be correct, ever. **And if not, then is it possible for a person to say that the preference of the Permanent Committee for Verdicts for not performing takfir of the one who abandons fasting, or hajj – for example – that this necessitates showing insignificance to these two mighty pillars of Islaam!!!** This, in this manner, is extremely false.

And finally: I make a notification here of the stance that I have adopted on the issue of the judgement on the ruler who rules by other than what Allaah has revealed - and that is the very same that has been adopted by our Teacher, the Lion of the Sunnah, the Allaamah, the Muhaddith, the Faqeeh, Shaikh Muhammad Naasir ud-Deen al-Albani and similarly it is what has been adopted by our Teacher, the Allaamah, the Skilled and Expert Imaam, Shaikh Abdul-Azeez bin Baaz – may Allaah shower them both with His mercy. Rather it is the preferred viewpoint of the respected Permanent Committee in its previous verdict (no. 5226) – when they quoted – may Allaah strengthen them with His aid – from the saying of Imaam al-Qurtubi, **"Whoever does not judge by what Allaah has revealed, rejecting (radd) the Qur'aan and rejecting (jahd) the saying of the Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) is a kaafir (disbeliever)..."** and then they said – may Allaah reward them well, **"...As for the one who judged by other than that which Allaah revealed while he knows and accepts that he is a sinner, having been led to judge by other than what Allaah has revealed on account of bribe that would be paid to him, or other than that, or due to his enmity towards one of the disputants [under his arbitration] or due to his nearness or friendship to him and other such similar things. Then this is not the major kufr. Such a person is just a sinner and he has fallen into the lesser kufr (kufr doon kufr), the lesser oppression (dhulm doon dhulm) and the lesser sin (fisq doon fisq)."**

I say: This is what my belief is and I have no addition to make to this and I have nothing to append to it. And I repeat, and then I repeat, where is the insignificance?! And Allaah is the Protector of the Muttaqeen.

Eighth: Everything that has proceeded is related to my book at-Tahdheer – and it is all very clear – by the praise of Allaah and His favour. As for my book Saihatu Nadheer, then the respected Permanent Committee’s statement concerning it was nothing more than that “...it is found to be a mere continuation of the previous book”! – as occurs in the text of the fatwaa. So in their view it takes the same ruling as the other book – like for like!!

But when the truth has now become clear about that one (the first book) then (the affair with) this one is the same as that one. And so I will not prolong the matter.

And finally, I request from our respected Mashaayikh, the members of the respected Committee – may Allaah strengthen them with His aid – to hastily begin with explaining their detailed view with respect to my criticism of them (i.e. this discourse) – along with my complete respect, veneration and admiration of their respected excellencies.

And as for those who want to pollute the purity of our respect for our Mashayikh and our connection with them and who want to stir in the murky waters to create the fitnah that they strive for and who kindle it and who compile for it, gather together for it, then let them not rejoice¹⁷. We will never grant them their oppression (against us)!! And we are with the

¹⁷ And it is not surprising that the Lords of Qutubiyah and their assistants and followers should continue with their legacy after the death of our two Noble Imaams, for aforesaid they displayed the same type of cowardice and deception – and so they continue in their cowardice and deception.

And of their political machinations and acts of cowardice was that they strove hard to obtain a statement from Shaikh Ibn Baz – rahimahullaah – concerning the Salafi Mashayikh and their criticism and refutations of the political activists. Yet they only managed to do so after much persuasion. Hence Shaikh Ibn Baz issued a statement of advice that was general to all the Du’aat.

After this they began to interpret this general advice as being specifically intended for the Salafi Mashayikh in general and Shaikh Rabee bin Hadee in particular. And they made the general folk think that Shaikh Ibn Baz’s intent was to defend the honour of the du’at, meaning themselves, since they had been spoken ill of. This was their claim.

And amongst such deceivers were the likes of ash-Shayjee, Salman al-Awdah, Muhammad Saeed al-Qahtani, and Safar al-Hawali. In his book, “Adwaa ‘alaa Fikr D’uaat as-Salafiyyah al-Jadeedah” (p10), ash-Shayjee states that the statement of Shaikh Ibn Baz was specifically intended for the Shaikhs of Madinah and Shaikh Rabee bin Hadee in particular.

Salman al-Awdah stated in his lecture, “Tahrir ul-Ard Am Tahrir ul-Insan”, “My dear brother... the statement which I have just read to you, we have been proposing to Shakh ‘Abdul-Aziz bin Baz for three months (to make this statement) and he was happy to issue it. However, the Shaikh’s various engagements made this very difficult. ... **I have full knowledge of it, from the time that this statement was just merely an idea, when it was given the go ahead, how it was composed, when the Shaikh actually made it, and what is related and not related to it!!! And those who were intended by it are the sedition makers in Madinah**”

And a person then asked, “Why did he not complete it... exposing the individuals who have spoken against the Ulamaa and the Du’at so long as they are upon this falsehood?!” To which Awdah replied, “**It is sufficient for you that Allaah has blackened their faces in light of this statement of Shaikh ‘Abdul-‘Aziz...**”

And Muhammad Sa’eed al-Qahtani said in his lesson, “Mukhtasir Ma’arij ul-Qubool” in the city of Jeddah, “...Those foolish ones come along and they circulate cassettes filled with revilement... and they are only a small band – and all praise is due to Allaah – and they are known as such, but we will not make this gathering impure by mentioning their names. **They are well known. And they rejected the Shaikh’s**

advice and the Shaikh – may Allaah protect him - continued in this matter with them (i.e. continued to advise them), but they only persisted in their obstinacy, and their publicising of faults, and causing doubts. So he wrote – may Allaah protect him – this advice...”

So this was the manner of these cowards, who after having admitted their ignorance of the true understanding of the state of affairs and who retreated into their snake burrows, then began, in order to save face, to spread lies and fabrications against those who had full knowledge of their situation and who had exposed them. **(And they had also been chastised like disobedient children by the likes of Shaikh Muhammad Amaan al-Jaamee and Shaikh Abdullaah al-Ubaylaan for preaching the doctrine of the Khawaarij by performing takfir of the society at large and takfir of the sinners! And in the face of whom they showed nothing but deafness and silence. And out of the greatness of their cowardice, rage and fury, a group of the followers of Salman al-Awdah secretly gathered together outside the mosque of Shaikh al-Ubaylaan – after one of the lessons of Shaikh al-Ubaylaan – with masks and weapons and beat up the noble Shaikh who was hospitalised and came close to death. This is a well-known affair... only because he exposed Safar and Salman and their wallowing in the madhhab of the Khawaarij – and put all of that in a book and which was spread wal-hamdulillaah, and which but enraged the Lords of Adulterated Principles and Qutubiyyah!!)**

Yet their plot was uncovered and their humiliation increased and the inner and hidden realities were brought to the forefront. The Shaikh and Allaamah ‘Abdul-Azeez Ibn Baz – may Allaah have mercy upon him – was asked about his intent in the statement that he had issued earlier. So he replied on 27/7/1412 in Makkah (and this is recorded on cassette),

“In the Name of Allaah, Full of Mercy, Ever-Merciful (to His Believing Servants). All Praise is due to Allaah and may Allaah send prayers upon His Messenger, his family and his companions. To proceed:

The statement that was issued by me, the intent behind it was to invite everybody, all of the du’at and the scholars, to make constructive criticism and not to criticise specific individuals amongst their brothers from the du’at. Rather everyone should offer sincerity of purpose to Allaah and His servants. And when he comes to know of an error of his brother, he should advise him for the sake of Allaah, the Mighty and Majestic, by writing or orally, without criticising him on cassettes or printed media and their likes. So that the hearts may remain upright and continue to have love and loyalty and that there may be co-operation upon righteousness and piety. However, the statement was not intended for our brothers, the people of Madinah, amongst the students of knowledge, teachers and du’at. And nor were those besides them in Makkah, Riyadh or Jeddah intended. Rather the advice was general.

And our Brothers, the well known Scholars in Madeenah, we do not have a doubt about them. They are possessors of a sound aqeedah and they are from Ahl us-Sunnah wal-Jamaa'ah, such as Shaikh Muhammad Amaan bin Alee, Shaikh Rabee' bin Haadee, Shaikh Saalih bin Sa'd as-Suhaimee, Shaikh Faalih bin Naafi', Shaikh Muhammad bin Haadee [al-Madkhalee] - all of them are known to us to have Istiqamah, knowledge and sound aqeedah. We ask increase in every good for them from Allaah and success in what pleases Him. However the callers of falsehood (du'aat ul-baatil) and the people who hunt (others) in murky waters, they are the ones who cause confusion amongst the people and who speak in these matters and they say: 'The intent was this and that', and this is not good. It is necessary to take the words in their best possible light. And the intent [behind the advice] was co-operation upon birr and taqwa, and to purify the hearts and to warn against backbiting which causes rancour and enmity. We ask Allaah for guidance and success for all.” [The Tape: Explanation of Shaikh Bin Baaz of his Statement].

And this is one illustration of many of the mischief and machinations of the political activists.

And now - after having shown the greatest of disrespect for the Senior Ulamaa in the days gone by - having ridiculed them, mocked them and accused them with what is unbefitting, they now promote the verdicts of the scholars which are in their favour, **without at the same time calling for that same research, investigation and objectivity which they themselves demanded in the days gone by!!!** And just as they promoted what they thought and presumed from the advice of Shaikh Ibn Baaz, they now promote what they think and presume (is the incontestable truth) from the Permanent Committees' verdict – and partnering them in all of this are the likes of Abu Qataadah, the Takfiri and Khariji, and others of his ilk.

Masahayikh and with the Ulamaa' – both before and after – and yet the truth is greater than all of us, more noble and greater in strength. So all of this – on my behalf is a criticism of the fatwaa...

And the good end belongs to the Muttaqeen (the Pious)

Zarqaa,
Jordan, 18/6/1421H

End of Shaikh Ali Hasan's reply.

CHAPTER:

Are Actions A Condition for the Validity (Sihhah) of Imaan or its Perfection (Kamaal)?

INTRODUCTION

As mentioned earlier, with respect to terms and phrases not reported from the Salaf, it is obligatory to investigate their meanings in light of the texts of the Book and the Sunnah, and then to affirm whatever they contain of truth and to reject whatever they contain of falsehood, and also to remove any obscurities that may exist in the use of such terms – since what one person may intend by them, might be something different to what another person intends by them, or understands from them. So with respect to the terms, “shart us-sihhah” and “shart ul-kamaal” we say that this issue needs to be addressed from different angles:

1. From the perspective of the applicability of these terms (shart us-sihhah, or shart ul-kamaal) to each and every branch of Imaan.
2. From the perspective of illustrating the link between the internal and the external (the heart and the body)
3. In relation to the person who dies without doing a single deed of goodness.
4. From the perspective of the abandonment of the acts of kufr

We will look at each of these in detail below, in light of the statements of the Imaams of the Salaf, past and present.

1. FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF EACH AND EVERY BRANCH OF IMAAN¹⁸

When we apply each of these terms to each of the branches of Imaan, that is all of the actions of righteousness, then the criterion of judgement as to whether an act of Imaan is a condition for the validity (sihhah) of Imaan (in the sense that its absence necessitates major kufr) or a condition for the perfection (kamaal) of Imaan is that the abandonment of the act must necessitate major kufr. We leave you with the words of Shaikh Ali Hasan and the Imaams of the Sunnah.

SHAIKH ALI HASAN AL-HALABI

Stated Shaikh Ali Hasan, “And to give more clarity we say: the branches of perfect Imaan (al-Imaan al-Kaamil) are seventy odd in number, or sixty odd in number – as occurs in the authentic hadeeth. And this – at the same time is the correct, valid Imaan (al-Imaan as-Saheeh).

However, when this perfect Imaan is lacking any of its branches, does this deficiency in them have an effect upon the correct, valid Imaan and render it a corrupt and false Imaan?! Or does the effect that results from this (deficiency) fall upon the perfect Imaan such that it now becomes deficient (naaqis)?!¹⁹

And what are the branches of Imaan, from the branches of perfect Imaan (al-Imaan as-Saheeh), the negation or absence of which makes this correct, valid Imaan (al-Imaan as-Saheeh_ corrupt (and invalid)?

Is it the 73rd branch?²⁰ Or the 64th? Or the 51st? The 49th? The 30th? The 25th? The 17th? The 6th? The 5th, 4th, or 3rd?

There only remains the two branches of Prayer and the Kalimah of Tawheed. As for the first, then there is a difference of opinion concerning it from the fiqh (jurisprudence) point of view²¹ – and it varies between what is more or less preferable (rajih wa marjooh) and what is

¹⁸ And looking at the issue from this perspective illustrates the misguidance of the Mu'tazilah and the Khawarij, who would perform takfir on account of the abandonment of righteous actions – and this meaning is contained in what is yet to come from the words of Imaam al-Albaani.

¹⁹ In other words if someone does not perform one of the branches of Imaan, does this affect its perfection (such that a person becomes a deficient believer) or does it affect its validity (such that a person becomes a disbelieving apostate)?

And refer to what has been said by Shaikh Abdur-Rahmaan bin Hasan Aal ash-Shaikh, “**When you have come to know that both the outward and inward actions are from the reality of Imaan, legislatively, then everything that is a deficiency in those actions whose deficiency does not expel from Islaam, then it is a deficiency in the obligatory perfection of Imaan (kamala ul-Imaan al-wajib).**” (Majmoo'at ur-Rasaa'il wal-Masaa'il 2/3).

²⁰ Removing something harmful from the floor!!

²¹ As occurs below in the words of Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen and also Shaikh Ibn Baaz. And this difference is a difference from the point of view of jurisprudence, and is not a difference that is related to aqeedah or the discussion of whether actions are a condition of perfection for Imaan or a condition of its validity!!! Unfortunately, in the zeal and enthusiasm inspired by Mohammad Qutb, Safar al-Hawali got carried away and began to accuse everyone who did not agree with him to have the affectations of the Murji'ah. And if we had said about him, “**this is the nature of the easily excitable folk**” concerning him, it would have surely enraged the Qutubists, and roused the strongest of emotions in their hearts – alas, if only they

correct and in error (sawaab wa khata'). Therefore, nothing remains except for the kalimah of Tawheed (the Shahadah) – which is actually a point of unanimous agreement of the people of Knowledge from Ahl us-Sunnah – absolutely, the one who abandons it is a disbeliever and apostate, outside the fold of Islaam²²...”²³

showed the same towards the one who said the same about the Kaleem of Allaah, Moosa (alaihis-salaam) – but it is Hizbiyyah that blinds and kills the heart!!

Stated Safar al-Hawali, **“And no one says that the one who abandons it (the prayer) is not a kaafir except one who has been affected by the (thought of) al-Irjaa’, whether he realises it or not.”**!! (Dhaahirat ul-Irjaa 2/650/651)

And then there come the rowdy hooligans and ignorant Muqallidah who claim that Safar al-Hawaali “scientifically exposed” the Irjaa’ present in the Ummah!!!

Stated Abdur-Razzaaq al-Afeefee, after textually stating that not performing takfir of the one who abandons prayer is the view of the majority, **“And this is the most well-known and the most abundantly (held) view, and it is almost an Ijmaa’, yet it is not an Ijmaa’, however due to the vast abundance of those who hold this view, it is almost an Ijmaa’”**. (Fataawaa ash-Shaikh Abdur-Razzaaq Afeefee p.394).

Rather, the truth of the matter is that Safar al-Hawaali “scientifically ascribed” al-Irjaa, to the vast majority of the Ummah, including Maalik and ash-Shaafi’ee and some of the great nobles from Ahl us-Sunnah – with “scientifically unacceptable” data and methods of reasoning!! And the truth of the matter is also that Mohammad Qutb led his best and most intimate student not only up the wrong road, but too far up the wrong road as well... and from Allaah is the refuge. And another truth of the matter is that Safar al-Hawali was affected by the madhhab of the Khawarij when he performed takfir of the sinners, **whether he realises it or not!!**

And for a “scientifically correct” refutation of the exaggerations and false claims of Safar al-Hawali and his erroneous “scientific method” refer to the imminent book “Hiwaar Haadee Ma’a Safar al-Hawaali” which compromises the refutations of Shaikh al-Albaani against the book that reached “the extremity in evil” – and indeed the Muhadditheen are the ones who are most “scientific” in their reasoning as opposed to other than them from the young and fresh newcomers...

My dear brother and sister for the sake of Allaah – do not equate between a Muhaddith, Faqeeh, Allaamah, Shaikh ul-Islaam, Aider of the Sunnah, Destroyer of Bid’ah – and between a fresh and reckless newcomer who places a Heretical Raafidee, Sayyid Qutb in the same league as Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah and Shaikh ul-Islaam Muhammad bin Abdul-Wahhab – and then places the one who is truly equal to them (Shaikh ul-Islaam al-Albaani) is in the same ranks as Muhammad Sa’eed Ramadaan al-Bootee, the Innovator!!! Where is the intellect? And where is the scientism? And where is the logic? And where is the allegiance and love for the People of the Sunnah? And where is disownment of the Heretical Innovators? From Allaah is the refuge and may He expose this great fraud and deception.

²² And it is from this perspective that Shaikh Ali Hasan included in his reply to the Permanent Committee the words of Shaikh ul-Islaam Muhammad bin Abdul-Wahhaab – rahimahullaah – in ad-Durar as-Sunniyyah (1/70), “The five pillars of Islam. The first of them [by which he disbelieves] is the two testimonies of faith. And then the remaining four pillars. **However, if he affirms their obligation but abandons them out of neglect, then even though we fight him in order to make him act upon them, we do not declare him a disbeliever by mere abandonment of them.** The scholars have differed about the disbelief of the one who abandoned the prayer out of laziness, without wilful denial, juhood. **So we do not perform takfir on account of anything except what the all of the scholars are united upon, and that is the two testimonies of faith.**”

And this view is also one of the views reported from Imaam Ahmad as is mentioned in Tabaqaat al-Hanaabilah (1/343), “A man does not leave Islaam with anything except committing Shirk with Allaah the Mighty. Or by rejecting the obligatory duties Allaah – the Mighty and Majestic – has laid down, wilfully opposing them (jaahidan). However if he left them out of laziness or neglect, he will be subject to Allaahs’ will. If He wishes, He will punish him and if He wishes, He will reward him.”

THE IMAAM AND SHAIKH UL-ISLAAM AL-ALBAANI

After preferring the view that **the one who abandons the prayer out of laziness and neglect is not a disbeliever, absolutely** the Shaikh (rahimahullaah) said : “And there is a fine point here which I have rarely seen pointed out or noticed so it is essential to point it out and explain it, so I say : That the one who abandons Prayer out of laziness is judged a Muslim as long as there is nothing to reveal the secrets of his heart or indicate that and he dies before repentance is sought from him - as is the case these days - **but if he is given the choice between death and between repentance and returning to regular Prayer, but he chooses death then in this case he dies a Kaafir.** Shaikhul-Islam [Ibn Taymiyyah] said : “And when a man refuses to pray even if he is to be killed then he will not be inwardly agreeing to the obligation of Prayer nor one who establishes it - and he is a Kaafir by agreement of the Muslims as is shown by the many reports from the Companions that such a one is a Kaafir - and as is shown by the authentic texts.”²⁴ Refer to as Silsilah as-Saheehah (1/117)

The Noble Shaikh also said, “**It is feared for the one who takes the affair of prayer lightly that he may die upon disbelief, and refuge is in Allaah, the Mighty**” (As-Silsilah ad-Da’eefah 1/132)

In light of this Imaam al-Albani holds that “the righteous actions, all of them, are a condition of perfection in the view of Ahl us-Sunnah, in opposition to the Khawarji and Mu’tazilah.”²⁵

THE IMAAM AND SHAIKH UL-ISLAAM IBN BAAZ

Question: “Are the scholars who speak with the absence of takfir of the one who leaves all of the actions of the limbs while at the same time professing the two testimonies with his tongue and having the basis of Imaan present in his heart from amongst the Murji’ah?”

Answer: “No. This one is from Ahl us-Sunnah wal-Jamaa’ah. Whoever speaks with the absence of takfir of the one who leaves fasting or zakaat or hajj – this one (i.e. the one who leaves these matters) is not a kaafir. However, he has committed a great sin. In the view of some scholars he is a kaafir, however the correct view is that he does not become a disbeliever with the major kufr. As for the one who leaves the prayer then the most correct view (al-arjah) is that this is major kufr when it is abandoned deliberately...”

²³ “Tanweer al-Arjaa Bi Tahqeeq Masaa’il il-Imaan wal-Kufr wal-Irjaa” (p.136)

²⁴ Majmoo’ul-Fataawaa’ (2/48)

²⁵ Silsilah as-Saheehah (7/137). **NOTE:** From the perspective that we are currently discussing in this section, those who say that actions are a condition for the validity (sihhah) of Imaan, then which actions do they mean? All of them? This is the madhhab of the Khawarij, those who performed takfir of the sinners **and of those who left the righteous deeds.** Hence, it is necessary, when using such terms to explain with tafseel – and to specify which of the actions are a condition for the validity (sihhah) of Imaan and which are not. And in this particular chapter, we observe that there is not single action, save the prayer - in the view of those who consider its abandonment to be major kufr – that can be considered to be a condition for the validity of Imaan, in the sense that its abandonment necessitates major kufr, corrupting a person’s Imaan thereby.

Question: “The actions of the limbs, are they a condition for the perfection (kamala) of Imaan of a condition for the validity (sihhah) of Imaan?”

Answer: “The actions of the limbs – such as fasting, charity, zakaat – **they are from the perfection of Imaan (kamaal ul-Imaan)**, and abandoning them constitutes weakness in one’s Imaan. As for the prayer, then the correct view is that leaving it is disbelief. **Therefore, when a person performs the righteous actions, then all of that is from the perfection of Imaan (kamaal ul-Imaan).**”

Source: “Hiwaar Hawla Masaa’il it-Takfeer Ma’a Allaamah ash-Shaikh Abdul-Azeez Ibn Baaz” and it is found also in al-Furqaan Magazine (no. 94).

SHAIKH MUHAMMAD BIN SAALIH AL-UTHAIMEEN

Question: “A person says ‘Laa ilaaha illallaaha’ sincerely from his heart, having belief in that (musaddiqan), showing submission (mustasliman) and compliance (munqaadan), **however, he does not perform with his limbs a single action of goodness despite having the ability to do so.** Is he under the will, mashee’ah of Allaah, or is he a disbeliever, kafir?”

Answer: “I say, and all praise is due to Allaah, the Lord of all the Worlds, that if he does not pray, then he is a disbeliever, even if he says, ‘Laa ilaaha illallaaha’. If he was truthful in his utterance of ‘Laa ilaaha illallaaha’, being sincere to it, by Allaah he would have not left the prayer. This is because prayer is the connection between Allaah Azzawajall and a person. And in the evidences that have come in the Qur’an and the Sunnah, the correct view (concerning them), and the consensus of the Companions which has been quoted by more than one authority, there is what indicates that the one who leaves the prayer is a disbeliever, who will abide in Hellfire forever, and He will not be subject to Allaah’s will. And when we say this, we are not saying something which is meaningless or empty. We say this because it is what is clearly indicated and meant by the words of Allaah and the words of His Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) and the statements of the Companions in which their consensus has been narrated.

‘Abdullaah bin Shaaqiq, said, ‘The Companions of Allaah’s Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) did not used to consider the abandonment of any action to constitute disbelief except the prayer.’ Also Ibn Raahawaih – may Allaah have mercy upon him - who is a well known Imaam, quoted the consensus of the Companions concerning the disbelief of the one who abandoned the prayer.

As for the remainder of the actions, then if a person abandons them, then he will be under the will of Allaah. Meaning, if he was not to give zakaah for example, then he will be under the will of Allaah, because when the Prophet (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) mentioned the punishment for the one who withholds the zakaah, he said, ‘Then he will see his path, either to Paradise or to Hellfire’, and it is known that if he was a disbeliever, there would not be a path to Paradise for him. And fasting and Hajj are likewise, whoever abandons them does not disbelieve, and he is under the will of Allaah, **however he is the most sinful of people.**²⁶”

²⁶ And in the view of those who do not perform takfir of the one who abandons prayer, such a one is the most sinful of people!! Not a believer, perfect in his faith, with Imaan like that of Mikaa’eel and Jibreel, as the mouthpiece of Mohammad Qutb would have you believe about his opponents!!

Question: “Is there a difference of opinion amongst Ahl us-Sunnah concerning the ruling upon such a man [i.e. the one who abandoned the prayer], bearing in mind the ruling upon the one who abandons the four pillars (of action), and the difference of opinion concerning it?”

Answer: “I am not able to deal comprehensively with the difference of opinion on this issue. However it is obligatory for us to know that [the ruling of] disbelief is a Shar’iah ruling and cannot be derived except from the Shari’ah, and the principle concerning Muslims is that Islam is affirmed for them until some evidence indicates that they have left it. And hastily rushing towards takfir is very, very, very dangerous. To such an extent that the Prophet (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) said, cautioning against takfir, “Whoever ascribes disbelief to someone or says to him ‘O enemy of Allaah’ and he is not actually like that, then it will fall back upon him’, i.e. it will return upon the one who made this claim.”

Question: “The difference that exists on the issue of the ruling upon the one who abandons the prayers, **is it one that is amongst Ahl us-Sunnah themselves** (i.e. does not expel one from the ranks of Ahl us-Sunnah), or one that is outside of that?”

Answer: “Yes, it is a difference that is within Ahl us-Sunnah. The Ahl us-Sunnah differ amongst themselves concerning this, just like they have differed concerning the obligation of wudhoo’ after eating the meat of the camel .”²⁷

Question: “Are the actions of the limbs a condition for the proof of the basis, asl, and correctness, sihhah, of Imaan or are they a condition for the perfection, kamaal of the Imaan that is obligatory?”

Answer: “**This varies.** The one who abandons the prayer, for example, is a disbeliever, since the prayer is one of the necessary requirements of Imaan. **But I advise my brothers to abandon these matters and investigating into them, but that they should return to what the Companions, may Allaah be pleased with them all, were upon. The Salaf us-Salih did not used to know about the likes of these matters. A believer is the one whom Allaah and His Messenger has made a believer and a disbeliever is one whom Allaah and His Messenger have made a disbeliever. Finish.**”²⁸

²⁷ And Shaikh ul-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah stated concerning this matter, “Making an affirmation with respect to it (i.e. the prayer with respect to its obligation) is required by unanimous agreement, however in abandoning the act there is a dispute.” Majmoo’ ul-Fataawaa (20/91). And Shaikh Ibn Uthaimin also said, “This issue is one of the greatest of issues of knowledge and the people of knowledge have disputed each other concerning it, both the Salaf and Khalaf”. Hukm Taarik us-Salaat (p.1). And perhaps all of this escaped the knowledge of the mouthpiece of Mohammad Qutb??

²⁸ And this is the very same that Shaikh Ali Hasan has adopted as his viewpoint – alongside the tafseel in the use of the terms “Condition for the Perfection of Imaan” and “Condition for the Validity of Imaan”. Meaning that the this whole issue revolves around the issue of prayer, since there is no action of righteousness, the abandonment of which necessitates kufr – in the view of those who speak with the takfir of the one who abandons prayer – except the prayer. And hence the prayer is a “condition for the validity of Imaan” and as for what is besides that amongst the righteous actions, then all of them are a “condition for the perfection of Imaan” as occurs in the answers of both Imaam Ibn Baaz and Shaikh Ibn Uthaimin above.

Source: Cassette Recording: Questions from Qatar on the Issues of Imaan and the Accusation of Irjaa Against Imaam al-Albani, 25th Muharram 1421

The Shaikh also said, **“What is correct is that there is no kufr in the abandonment of any action amongst the actions except the prayer”**.

Source: Cassette: Makaalamaat Haatifiyyah Ma’a Mashaayikh ad-Da’wah as-Salafiyyah” (no.4), From Algeria.

SUMMARY

When we say that with respect to applying these terms to each of the righteous actions, then bearing in mind the difference of opinion concerning the one who abandons the prayer – which occurs amongst Ahl us-Sunnah and which is a difference of jurisprudence (fiqh), – then the righteous actions are a condition for the perfection (kamala) of Imaan, and this is what is clearly apparent from Imaam al-Albani, and it is also what is apparent from both Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen and Imaam Baz. **And holding this particular viewpoint does not necessitate that a person does not consider righteous actions to be integral to Imaan and essential to it²⁹**, just like it does not necessitate that a person who holds the view of the absence of takfir of the one who abandons the prayer –also holds that prayer is not from Imaan and a requirement of it!!! And that Imaan does not increase and decrease on account of its performance or abandonment!!! And that the one who abandons it is perfect in his faith and will not enter the Fire! So reflect! Otherwise, we could say that all of those from Ahl us-Sunnah who do not perform takfir of the one who abandons fasting and hajj - in the view of those who do perform takfir - do not consider these actions to be from Imaan!! And hence they do not consider actions to be a condition of validity (sihhah), and hence, they have adopted the views of the Murji’ah?!!

And to add clarification to this matter, we say that if we asked the one who holds that abandoning the prayer is major kufr that if a person performed hajj, fasted, gave zakah and did every other righteous deed yet abandoned the prayer, is he a Muslim. The answer is no. And if we said that a person performs the prayer but abandons zakaah, fasting, hajj and every other act, is he a Muslim? The answer is yes. In this case we say that the prayer is a condition for the validity (sihhah) of Imaan³⁰ and the rest of the actions are a condition for the perfection (kamaal) of Imaan. Similarly, if we asked the one who holds abandoning prayer, fasting, and zakah - or any one of them - is a disbeliever about a person who leaves any one of them, is he a Muslim? The answer is no. And if we said that he fulfils these pillars yet abandons every other act is he a Muslim? The answer is yes. Hence, these pillars of Islaam are a condition for the validity (sihhah)

²⁹ And this is different to some amongst the Murji’ah who say “Imaan is the belief of the heart (tasdeeq) and the statement of the tongue, and that actions are necessary in addition to it.” – for they exclude actions from the reality of Imaan and claim that actions are from the fruits of Imaan.

³⁰ And hence the “jins ul-’amal”, has been confined to prayer, and therefore it is obligatory for the one who holds this view that he does not generalise by saying that the one who abandons actions generically (i.e. jins ul-’amal) is a kaafir, rather he should be specific and say that it is the prayer that is a condition for the validity (sihhah) of Imaan.

of Imaan³¹ and as for the rest of the actions, then they are a condition for the perfection (kamaal) of Imaan (while also being from Imaan).³²

And this is the way of Ahl us-Sunnah with respect to these issues, from this perspective, in opposition to the Khawarij and the Mu'tazilah – whose viewpoint of actions being a condition for the validity (sihhah) of Imaan, led them to perform takfir of the sinners who left some of the outward obligations (of worship).

³¹ And hence the “jins ul-'amal” has been confined to prayer, zakaah and fasting, and therefore it is obligatory for the one who holds this view that he does not generalise by saying that the one who abandons actions generically (i.e. jins ul-'amal) is a kaafir, rather he should be specific and say that it is the prayer, fasting and zakaah that is a condition for the validity (sihhah) of Imaan.

³² And this meaning is contained in numerous narrations from the Salaf, amongst them:

Imaam Ahmad: Salih bin Ahmad bin Hanbal said, “I asked my father what is its increase and decrease? He replied, “Its increase is in action and its decrease is in the abandonment of action, such as his abandonment of prayer, zakaah, hajj and fulfilling the other obligations. So it decreases or increases by (the presence or absence) of action”. (Reported by al-Khallaal in as-Sunnah 3/581). And it is known that there are two views of Imaam Ahmad on the issue of the abandonment of prayer.

Ibn Hazm: “And whoever neglects all of the actions then he is a sinful believer, deficient in his Imaan, but does not disbelieve (on account of this).” (al-Muhallaa 1/40-41 Issue No. 79)

2. IN RELATION TO THE LINK BETWEEN THE HEART AND THE LIMBS

What can also be intended by the term “shart us-sihhah” (condition for the validity of Imaan) is to illustrate and affirm the link between the heart and the actions of the body. So from this perspective it is said, “actions are a condition for the validity (sihhah) of Imaan, since they give evidence to the basis of Imaan in the heart, and their presence indicates its presence (i.e. Imaan in the heart) and their absence indicates its absence”.

And from this perspective, if a person said actions are a condition for the perfection of Imaan (and not the validity of Imaan), intending by that to negate that there is a link between the actions of the heart and the actions of the limbs and to negate that what is in the heart must to be manifested on the limbs – then this is erroneous, since it is the view of the Murji’ah and leads to the saying that actions are not from Imaan. In opposition to them Ahl us-Sunnah maintain that there is a necessary link (at-talaazum) between the heart and the body.

Imaam al-Albaani illustrated this point when he followed up Imaam an-Nawawi for omitting the words “and your actions” at the end of the hadeeth, “Indeed Allaah does not look at your bodies and nor at your faces, rather he looks at your hearts...”

Imaam al-Albani stated in his introduction to Riyaadh us-Saaliheen, “And Muslim and others added to this, in a narration, “and your actions”, and this (hadeeth) has been referenced fully in “Takhreej ul-Halaal wal-Haraam” (410). And this addition is very important, since many people understand this hadeeth in an erroneous manner without this addition. **So when you command them with what the Legislation has ordered them such as growing the beard and not imitating the Kuffar and other such Sharee’ah obligations – they answer you by saying that what depends is what is in the heart, and then they use this hadeeth to find evidence for their claim!** Without their knowing this correct addition (to the wording) which indicates that Allaah – the Blessed and Most High – looks also at their actions... **And the reality is that it is not possible to imagine the rectitude of the heart except by rectitude of the actions and nor rectitude of the actions, except by rectitude of the heart.**”

And then Shaikh al-Albaani follows up the statement of Ibn ‘Allaan in his “Sharh” (4/406) when he said in explanation of this hadeeth, “...meaning, that He – the Most High – does not grant reward on account of the size of the body, or the beauty of the face, or the abundance of actions”! So Shaikh al-Albaani stated in the course of his criticism, “**...and how can it be understood that Allaah will not look at action – just like (He will not look at) the bodies and faces – when it is the basis upon which a person enters into Paradise after Imaan.**”

After quoting the above Shaikh Ali Hasan then says³³, “I say, this is a principle from the principles of Ahl us-Sunnah – on account of which they separate (themselves) from the Murji’ah – in the issue of Imaan – and in which they (the Murji’ah) went astray and deviated – and it is: **the reality of the fundamental relationship (at-talaazum) between the external, in terms of both speech and action, and the internal, in terms of assent (tasdeeq) and submission**

³³ At-Ta’reef wat-Tanbi’ah (p.33)

(idh'aan) - and (in this affair did they, the Murji'ah) oppose their saying, both in wording and in true meaning!!

And this matter is firmly established with Shaikh ul-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah and amongst his sayings in this regard is, "The basis of Imaan is in the heart, and this is the speech and action of the heart, and this is its affirmation (iqraar) and assent (tasdeeq) and its love (hubb) and compliance (inqiyaad). **And whatever is in the heart then what it necessitates and requires must appear upon the limbs. And when (a person) does not act upon what it necessitates and requires (of the external actions) this indicates its absence or its weakness**³⁴. **And for this reason, the outward actions are from the obligatory requirement of the Imaan of the heart and they are necessarily required by it, and they [the actions] constitute an affirmation (tasdeeq) of what is in the heart, giving evidence (daleel) to it, being a witness (shaahid) over it.** And they [the actions] constitute a branch from the totality of Absolute Imaan, forming a part of it. However, whatever is in the heart is the foundation (asl) of what emanates from the limbs."³⁵ End of Shaikh Ali Hasan's words.

And this is also explained by Ibn al-Qayyim who said, "And then there is another principle: That the reality of Imaan is composed of speech and action. Speech is of two types: 1) the speech of the heart which is its belief and 2) the speech of the tongue which is speaking with the word (kalimah) of Islaam. And action is of two types: 1) the action of the heart which is its intention (niyyah) and sincerity (ikhlaas) and 2) actions of the limbs. So when these four matters cease (to exist) then Imaan in its totality ceases, and when the tasdeeq (assent) of the heart ceases to exist, the remaining aspects of Imaan will not benefit a person. For the tasdeeq (assent) of the heart is a condition for having belief in the other aspects and their being of benefit to the person.

And when the actions of the heart cease while the tasdeeq of the heart still remains, then this is the point upon which there is a battle between the Murji'ah and Ahl us-Sunnah. Ahl us-Sunnah are agreed that Imaan ceases in this case and that the presence of tasdeeq (of the heart) without any actions of the heart will not be of benefit to a person. The actions of the heart being its love and compliance... **And when it is the case that Imaan ceases when the actions of the heart cease, then it is not entirely objectionable that it should also cease when the greatest of the acts of the limbs cease**³⁶, especially when the absence of such actions is

³⁴ Reflect upon his saying, "**this indicates its absence (adam) or its weakness (da'f)**" and refer to what comes further below in our discussion.

³⁵ Majmoo' ul-Fataawaa (7/644)

³⁶ Bearing in mind that Ibn Qayyim's view on the abandonment of prayer is that it is not major kufr, these words are synonymous in meaning with the saying of Shaikh Ibn Uthaimin, "I say, and all praise is due to Allaah, the Lord of all the Worlds, that if he does not pray, then he is a disbeliever, even if he says, 'Laa ilaaha illallaaha'. **If he was truthful in his utterance of 'Laa ilaaha illallaaha', being sincere to it, by Allaah he would have not left the prayer.**" Cassette: Questions From Qatar (30th April 2000).

Likewise the saying of Imaam al-Albaani, "**It is feared for the one who takes the affair of prayer lightly that he may die upon disbelief, and refuge is in Allaah, the Mighty**" (As-Silsilah ad-Da'eefah 1/132)

And this also the same meaning mentioned by others such as Imaam, 'Abdul-Haqq al-Ishbeeliyy who said, "Know – may Allaah have mercy upon you – that abandoning the prayer, even if it is not kufr (that expels from the religion) – as has been stated by those – may Allaah be pleased with them – **then it is indeed one of the greatest of causes that lead to kufr...**" (As-Salaat wat-Tahajjud p.96)

... tied to the absence of the heart's love and compliance, which itself is tied to the absence of the firm and resolute tasdeeq (assent) of the heart as has preceded. Hence, the absence of the obedience of the limbs is necessitated by the absence of the obedience of the heart, since if the heart was obedient and compliant, then the limbs too would be obedient and compliant. And it is also necessitated from the absence of the heart's obedience and compliance, the absence of such tasdeeq (assent of the heart) which necessitates (outward) obedience, and this is the reality of Imaan, since Imaan is not just mere tasdeeq (assent) as has preceded, it is in fact tasdeeq (assent) which necessitates obedience and compliance.”³⁷

So Ahl us-Sunnah affirm this is a principle and this is a firmly established principle in the Book and the Sunnah and the statements of the Imaams of the Ummah³⁸. However, this now raises another issue, which has been the subject of controversy and has entered into the discussion of whether actions are a condition for the perfection (kamaal) or a condition for the validity (sihhah) of Imaan, and this is in relation to the person who utters the Shahaadah, with the assent of the heart (tasdeeq), but does not do a single act of goodness, dying upon that. And the existence of this type of person is mentioned in the hadeeth of Abu Sa'eed al-Khudree³⁹ in which there occurs, “... **and Allaah will take out of it (Hellfire) people who had not done any good.**”

³⁷ Kitaab us-Salaah (pp.53-54)

³⁸ And this occurs abundantly in the writings of Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah:

A-Jawaab as-Saheeh (6/487): “And we have dealt comprehensively in this issue, pertaining to Imaan, and we have explained that what exists in the heart of assent (tasdeeq) and love (hubb) of Allaah His Messenger, and veneration (ta'dheem) for them, then it must necessarily be displayed upon the limbs, and it is likewise in the opposite scenario. And from this (principle) the absence of what externally necessitates (that which is in the heart, i.e. the actions) can be used to indicate the absence of that which is internally necessitated (i.e. the tasdeeq of the heart and its actions), as occurs in the saheeh hadeeth from the Prophet (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam), “Verily there is a piece of flesh in the body, which if it is sound then the whole body is sound and which if it is corrupt, the whole body will be corrupt”...”

Majmoo' al-Fataawaa (18/272): “...When assent (tasdeeq) is established in the heart, what is required by it of action, will never be absent. Perfect knowledge (ma'rifah) and true love (mahabbah) cannot settle (in the heart, without their being any signs of that externally...”

³⁹ Reported by Muslim.

3. IN RELATION TO THE ONE WHO DOES NOT PERFORM ANY GOOD DEEDS

What is connected to this matter has been touched upon before, in the answers of both Imaam al-Albani, Imaam Ibn Baaz and Shaikh Ibn Uthaimeen, (refer to no. 1) – and we saw that the issue revolved around the performance or abandonment of prayer – in the view of those who hold its abandonment to be major kufr. **However, this was from the perspective discussed in no. 1, namely from the point of view of applying the terms “shart us-sihhah” and “shart ul-kamaal” to each and every branch of Imaan, that is the deeds of goodness.**

Yet how can this be reconciled with what has been discussed in no. 2, namely the issue of the fundamental relationship between the actions of the heart and the actions of the limbs? And that the absence of the actions of the limbs necessitates the absence of the actions of the heart, which can in turn necessitate the absence of the assent (tasdeeq) of the heart and hence terminate Imaan completely – as explained by Ibn al-Qayyim, and also by Ibn Taymiyyah? Here, we are looking at the issue from a different perspective, and we are imposing this concept (of the link between the actions of the heart and those of the limbs) on to the terms under discussion.

So we say:

It is necessary to understand the various categorisations of people who have entered into Islaam, in order to understand the underlying issues.

As for those who attribute themselves to Islaam, then they are of the following categories:

The first: Those who desire to enter into Islaam, so they are ordered to pronounce the Shahaadatayn (the two testimonies) – while the conditions of the Shahaadatayn present i.e. assent (tasdeeq) and submission (idh'aan) – however, there are no outward actions required for their Islaam to be considered correct or valid, except for their utterance of the Shahaadatayn, and this is known by unanimous consensus.

The second: Those who become Muslims, having Imaan of the heart and having pronounced the two testimonies of faith but die before they can fulfil any outward obligatory actions. They are believers by consensus and they will not be subjected to the threat (of punishment).

The third: Those who have become Muslims however, they do not know anything about Islaam from its outward actions, except (repeating) the Shahaadatayn while having internal compliance (inqiyaad). They are believers and this is the condition of the people at the end of time, prior to the Day of Judgement (as occurs in the authentic texts).

The fourth: Those who have become Muslims but they have been neglectful in their actions, and hence they do not fulfil what they have been commanded with and they commit that which they have been forbidden. Hence, their condition is to be examined:

A) Have they committed an action which necessitates major kufr? And is this act one whose being major kufr is unanimously agreed upon by the Salaf? And are the required conditions for takfir present and the preventative barriers to it removed? So if he

commits what necessitates kufr that is agreed to be so by the Salaf, with the required conditions for takfir present and any barriers absent then such a one is a kaafir, and his utterance of the Shahaadah will not benefit him, rather his actions have been nullified. And whoever does not declare such a one to be a disbeliever is an astray Innovator.

B) If he commits an act which necessitates major kufr concerning which there is a difference of opinion (as to its being major kufr), such as abandoning the prayer, or fasting or zakaah, or hajj and so on, then this falls into those issues which are treated in this manner from amongst the other issues (of difference).

C) If he commits that which is not major kufr by unanimous consensus (ijmaa') then such a one is not declared a disbeliever, and whoever declares such a one to be a disbeliever is an Innovator, astray.

D) When a person's Islaam is established, and that is by his utterance of the Shahaadah, **and then he does not do a single good deed at all**, rather he continues in doing the obscene sins and the forbidden matters, **then it is this particular situation in which there is contention**. And this type of person is almost impossible to find. However, there are some scenarios which might exist:

1. The one who utters the Shahadah (with tasdeeq and inqiyaad) and continues upon this but does not do any of the good deeds and commits the forbidden deeds, then just before his death, he repents and shows remorse, resolved to do good, yet before he can do any good (save that what he had done previously of the repetition of his Shahaadah), he dies. Such a one could enter Paradise, without having done any actions of the limbs.
2. The person who becomes Muslim in some of the remote areas (in the lands of disbelief) where there are hardly any other Muslims and there is no one to teach him or to advise or admonish him, however he has uttered the Shahaadah (with tasdeeq and inqiyaad) and so he continues in his ignorance, due to circumstantial reasons, not being able to do any good – while falling into some of that which is forbidden, until he passes away (while dying upon the Shahaadah with tasdeeq and inqiyaad). Then such a one is similar to the second category of people discussed earlier⁴⁰, save that this one does not die immediately after becoming Muslim but some time later, however, due to circumstantial reasons, he could not do any good – due to the absence of the one who can show him and direct him – and this situation is often found in other than the lands of Islaam.

And other such examples may exist. However, we must address the issue that we have finally come to and that is, **a person who is a Muslim (or becomes Muslim) and spends his whole life in doing the forbidden matters and abandoning the**

⁴⁰ Those who become Muslims, having Imaan of the heart and having pronounced the two testimonies of faith but died before they could fulfil any outward obligatory actions. They are believers by consensus and they will not be subjected to the threat (of punishment).

obligatory matters (not doing a single deed of goodness), does his Islaam remain (so he enters Paradise) or is he a disbeliever, apostate?

The answer: This type of person is almost impossible to be found, since it is very difficult to find even a disbeliever who has not done an act of goodness, then what about a Muslim? This is something that exists only in the mind (at best). And the fact that this is almost impossible to be found is due to a number of reasons:

1. It is not possible to find a Muwahhid, let alone a Mushrik, who has never done any good whatsoever in his life, rather, there must be some good that has emanated from him, even if it is only a very small amount.⁴¹
2. It is not possible to actually make the ruling upon a Muslim that he has never done even an atom's weight of goodness (in action) in his life, while knowing that he is a Muslim (having the basis of Imaan), since such a ruling requires that he be constantly observed, day and night, in secret and in open, and this is for none but the Lord of the Worlds, the all-Knowing – until even a person's wife cannot accompany her husband at all times.

Based upon the above two observations, **it is not possible for us to judge an individual whom we know to be a Muslim, that he has never done an act of goodness in his life (jins ul-'amal) and following this, we cannot declare him a disbeliever on account of our mere suspicion that he has never done any good** – bearing in mind the difference of opinion concerning the issue of prayer.

However, we say that **if such a person is ever found**, who has the basis of Imaan (tasdeeq and inqiyaad of the heart) by having uttered the Shahaadah, **and then he spends his whole life, without having done an atom's weight of goodness at all, while having the ability to do so, and falls into the acts of sin and disobedience**, then we say that such a person's Imaan is indeed corrupt, and the absence of his actions indicate the absence (**or the passing away**) of the basis of the Imaan in his heart – as has preceded from the likes of Ibn al-Qayyim and Shaikh ul-Islaam and that it is necessarily so in his case that the absence of any good actions, in their totality, and his indulgence in what is forbidden, indicates the absence of the actions of the heart (love and submission), which indicate the absence of the assent (tasdeeq) of the heart.

Based upon this, it is obligatory to make a distinction between:

- Affirming that this principle is true and correct (i.e. the fundamental link (at-talaazum) between the heart and the body and that the actions of the limbs are tied to the actions of

⁴¹ Bearing in mind that smiling in a Muslim's face, or removing something harmful from the floor, or uttering a supplication, such as before food or entering the house, or such as assisting another Muslim in the affairs of the world, or an act of righteousness to the parents, and so on are acts of goodness which the vast majority of Muslims will have performed – while having the basis of Imaan in their hearts – bearing in mind the difference of opinion on the issue of the abandonment of prayer.

the heart, which in turn are tied to the assent, tasdeeq, of the heart – all of which necessitates that actions are from Imaan.) – in opposition to the straying Murji'ah.

And:

- Using this principle to perform takfeer of a Muslim, **about whom it is not known whether he has done an atom's weight of goodness in his life or not**, and who has the basis of Imaan – while bearing in mind the difference of opinion concerning the abandonment of prayer.

The first is a foundational principle, necessitated by the Book and the Sunnah and the sayings of the Imaams of the Ummah and is found in the statements that we have quoted above from Shaikh ul-Islaam and Ibn al-Qayyim above and illustrates the reality of Imaan.

And the second is the application of what this principle necessitates of making a judgement upon a specific individual (tatbeeq) and it is concerning the likes of this that we observe the words of Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah, **“Whoever's Islaam was affirmed with certainty, then it cannot be removed from him with doubt. Rather, his Islaam will never cease until after the proof has been established against him and any doubt [concerning his case] has been removed.”**⁴²

And also what was mentioned earlier from Shaikh Ibn Uthameen concerning, the question: “Is there a difference of opinion amongst Ahl us-Sunnah concerning the ruling upon such a man [i.e. the one who abandoned the prayer], bearing in mind the ruling upon the one who abandons the four pillars (of action), and the difference of opinion concerning it?”

His reply being, **“I am not able to deal comprehensively with the difference of opinion on this issue. However it is obligatory for us to know that [the ruling of] disbelief is a Shar'iah ruling and cannot be derived except from the Shari'ah, and the principle concerning Muslims is that Islam is affirmed for them until some evidence indicates that they have left it. And hastily rushing towards takfir is very, very, very dangerous”**⁴³. To such

⁴² Majmoo' ul-Fataawaa' (12/468).

⁴³ **BENEFIT:** And this is what makes us resolute that those who constantly discuss the issue of “shart us-sihhah” – from the perspective of the link between the heart and the limbs (**and not from the point of view of actions being from Imaan**) – and who try to establish that the one who does not have a single good deed in his favour is a kaafir – and from this avenue accuse their opponents with Irjaa' – then they are but talking about a theoretical issue – that they themselves cannot verify – and which has no real and tangible benefit when it comes to making actual rulings of takfir upon those Muslims whose Islaam is known with certainty – but are neglectful in their duties towards their Lord.

And reflect carefully upon the words of Shaikh Ibn Uthameen when asked, “Are the actions of the limbs a condition for the proof of the basis, asl, and correctness, sihhah, of Imaan or are they a condition for the perfection, kamaal of the Imaan that is obligatory?”

His reply: **“This varies.** The one who abandons the prayer, for example, is a disbeliever, since the prayer is one of the necessary requirements of Imaan. **But I advise my brothers to abandon these matters and investigating into them, but that they should return to what the Companions, may Allaah be pleased with them all, were upon. The Salaf us-Salih did not used to know about the likes of these**

an extent that the Prophet (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) said, cautioning against takfir, “Whoever ascribes disbelief to someone or says to him ‘O enemy of Allaah’ and he is not actually like that, then it will fall back upon him’, i.e. it will return upon the one who made this claim.”⁴⁴

And it is from this perspective that Shaikh Ali Hasan stated, in his reply to the Permanent Committee, “The result of this term “Shart us-Sihhah” (Condition for the Validity [of Imaan]) – **when it relates to the presence or absence of Takfir** – in my view, is exactly what has been said by Shaikh ul-Islaam Muhammad bin Abdul-Wahhaab – rahimahullaah – as occurs in ad-Durar as-Sunniyyah (1/70), “The five pillars of Islam. The first of them [by which he disbelieves] is the two testimonies of faith. And then the remaining four pillars. **However, if he affirms their obligation but abandons them out of neglect, then even though we fight him in order to make him act upon them, we do not declare him a disbeliever by mere abandonment of them.** The scholars have differed about the disbelief of the one who abandoned the prayer out of laziness, without wilful denial, juhood. **So we do not perform takfir on account of anything except what the all of the scholars are united upon, and that is the two testimonies of faith.**”

And after all of this, O Sunni, go back and read section no. 1, from the words of the three greatest Scholars of our time, **a second time – with reflection and due deliberation** - and then you will see the truth that is contained in their words – and the truth contained in the words of Shaikh Ali Hasan -- and it is by them that we guide ourselves!!!

And everything that we have explained here, then the truth of it, and the rulings pertaining to it, and the delivering stance concerning it, is but contained in the words of the three Notables of this era (Imaam Ibn Baaz, Imaam al-Albaani and Shaikh Ibn Uthaimeen) in what has preceded. And this is what ends the dispute of all the sects!! And in Allaah lies all success.

matters. A believer is the one whom Allaah and His Messenger has made a believer and a disbeliever is one whom Allaah and His Messenger have made a disbeliever. Finish.”

And reflect also upon his words, concerning Imaam al-Albani, “We know the man from his books – may Allaah have mercy upon him – and I know him from sitting with him on occasions. He is Salafi in aqeedah, of sound manhaj. **However some people desire to perform takfeer of the servants of Allaah on account of something that Allaah did not perform takfeer of them. Then they claim that whoever opposes them in this takfeer is a Murji’ – a lie, slander, and mighty fabrication. Therefore, do not listen to this saying regardless of whomever it comes from!”** Answers to Questions from Qatar (30th April 2000)

⁴⁴ Answers to Questions from Qatar (30th April 2000)

4. FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF THE ACTS OF MAJOR KUFR

And amongst the sophistry used in the assault against Ahl us-Sunnah is that some people have combined the matter of “abandoning the righteous actions” with “performing the acts necessitating major kufr” and making the term “shart us-sihhah” (condition for the correctness of Imaan) applicable to both of them – at the same time. Such that if anyone denies that actions are a condition for the validity (sihhah) of Imaan (upon the understanding outlined in no. 1 above)⁴⁵ then he is guilty of Irjaa’ since he does not hold that kufr is by action, just like Imaan has actions, and that he does not consider that if a person did not avoid kicking the Qur’an or mocking the religion or reviling the Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) and the likes, that his Imaan is invalid, and therefore, he has excluded actions (which include doing the commanded and avoiding the forbidden) from Imaan.

Shaikh Ali Hasan said, “And it is strange that some of them confuse between the two issues of “abandoning the righteous actions” and “performing the acts necessitating major kufr” – and treat them like for like [with respect to these terms of perfection(kamaal) and validity (sihhah)]”⁴⁶

While the point of discussion is related to the acts of righteousness, that is the branches of Imaan, as occurs in the saying of the Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam), and their being integral to Imaan, then nevertheless, if we impose this particular perspective (of the acts of kufr) on to the terms that we are discussing, then we would simply say that the abandonment of those actions which necessitate major kufr (such as prostrating to an idol, kicking the Qur’an, supplicating to the dead for assistance, reviling the religion or mocking the religion and so on) is a condition for the validity (sihhah) of Imaan. And the abandonment of those actions which do not necessitate major kufr is a condition for the perfection (kamaal) of Imaan.

Hence, in this case, when we say that actions are a condition for the validity (sihhah) of Imaan, then we mean the performance of those actions whose abandonment necessitates major kufr – and that is the prayer, in the view of those who hold its abandonment to be major kufr – **as well as** the abandonment of all the actions whose performance necessitates major kufr.

And when we say actions are a condition for the perfection (kamaal) of Imaan, then we mean by that the performance of all the actions whose abandonment does not necessitate major kufr – bearing in mind the difference of opinion on the abandonment of prayer – **as well as** the abandonment of all the actions whose performance does not necessitate major kufr (i.e. sins and disobedience).

And this is sufficient to answer the doubters as well as repel those who stand and observe like birds of prey...as if they are in an observatory watching every movement...aiming to open up the fort of Sunnah and Salafiyyah and enter into its midst the concepts of Bid’ah and Qutubiyyah.

⁴⁵ In other words bearing in mind the difference of opinion concerning the abandonment of prayer then – in the view of those who hold the view of the absence of takfir - all of the acts of righteousness are a completion of Imaan (while being integral to it and part of it) - as opposed to being a condition for the validity of Imaan.

⁴⁶ At-Ta’reef wat-Tanbi’ah (p.86)

CHAPTER:

Imaan in the View of Abu Muhammad al-Yamaani

Stated the Imaam, Abu Muhammad al-Yamani, in his book, 'The Beliefs of the Seventy-Three Sects', who after refuting the beliefs of all the sects of Murji'ah (which are about nineteen in number⁴⁷), said in explanation of the position of Ahl us-Sunnah wal-Jamaa'ah, in the most excellent of words:

⁴⁷ And they are the: Jahmiyyah, Karraamiyyah, Mareesiyyah, Kullaabiyyah, Gheelaaniyyah, Najjaariyyah, Ilhaamiyyah, Muqaatiliyyah, Younusiyyah, Ja'diyyah, Shubaibiyyah, Thawbaaniyyah, Hashawiyyah, Muhaajiriyyah, Sawfataa'iyyah, Lafdhiyyah, Shamariyyah, Khawarij, and Mu'tazilah!!!

BENEFIT: THE PROLIFERATION OF THE GROUPS OF BID'AH

Know O Sunni, that Ahl us-Sunnah preserved this religion by exposing the Innovations and their inventors and propounders – and documenting all of that. However, they did not stop there, since Innovations are moulded and shaped and distorted and changed and renewed in different forms and fashions by those who come after the original founders, and so Ahl us-Sunnah, followed all of them up and exposed them too – and all praise is due to Allaah who sent them in every generation – no doubt, the Muhadditheen amongst them. And do not forget also, that Ahl ul-Bid'ah, shared and distributed their innovations and acquired them from each other, such that in one man, you would find numerous innovatory matters.

And it is here that we say about the **Qutubiyyah** – that the original thought came from Sayyid Qutb – and our Ulamaa refuted this Qutubism, wal-hamdulillaah – but the original thought did not stop there. Rather, those who promoted the original teachings of Qutubism, and made modifications to it were also exposed and refuted. And amongst them, the **Surooriyyah** (the sect of Muhammad Suroor), the **Turaathiyyah** (the sect of Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq – those from his original group (Ihya at-Turaath) who did not disown his heresies concerning working with the Innovators and biased partisanship (Hizbiyyah), and revilement of the Salafi Ulamaa), the **Ar'ooriyyah** (the sect of Adnaan Ar'oor, who is trying to hide a very insidious form of Qutubism, teaching "manhaj" from the books of Sayyid Qutb and reviling the Salafi Ulamaa, and promoting the bid'ah of al-Muwaazanah in order to defend the Innovators), the **New Qutubiyyah** ("**Qutubiyyah Jadeedah**", the sect of Mohammad Qutb, who have used the weapon of the accusation of al-Irjaa' in order to hide their own goals and machinations – which are but the teachings of the original founder, Sayyid Qutb) – and then many more besides them such as the **Qataadiyyah** (the sect of Abu Qataadah), the **Hamzawiyyah** (the sect of Abu Hamzah), the **Faisaliyyah** (the sect of Abdullaah Faisal, the Khariji of the UK), the **Mis'ariyyah** (the sect of Muhammad al-Mis'ari), the **Turaabiyyah** (the sect of Hasan Turabi) - the fountain and spring of every single one of them, the books of Sayyid Qutb and his heretical writings.

And do not forget also the Bannaawiyyah (the sect of Hassan al-Bannaa) who innovated the principle of working with, and showing love and affection towards the Innovators, Heretics and Infidels, in their well known principle, "Let us excuse each other in that which we differ and let us work together in that which we agree" (including in that Shirk with the Lord of the Worlds and the Jews and Christians)!! So you will observe many of the above sects (the Surooriyyah, the Turaathiyyah, the Ar'ooriyyah, the Qataadiyyah, the Faisaliyyah) and others that we have mentioned showing affectation to the Bannaawi innovation and a proof of that is that you will see them collaborating with the Innovators (and with each other), promoting their conferences and their speakers (who are not free from deviation and heresies in matters of aqidah and manhaj), making excuses for them, joining hands with them, sitting on their platforms, **yet they all continue to display the severity of their hatred towards the Ahl us-Sunnah, Ashaabul-Athar!!!** This is a true reality my dear brother and sister – and what after truth is there, but misguidance?

And then to show the truth of what we have mentioned, we simply make a reminder, that the books of Sayyid Qutb are actually the fountain and spring for all of the groups of Innovation. So you see that the Iranian Rafidis translate the books of Sayyid Qutb and promote them (since the concept of revolution was in their blood), you find Hikmatyar taking these books from the Iranian Rafidis to promote his own movement in Afghanistan (culminating in the murder of the Salafi Shaikh, Jameel ur-Rahmaan), and you

“...they say: Imaan is affirmation, iqrar, with the tongue, acquaintance, ma’rifah, of the heart and actions of the limbs. **And all of the obligatory actions of obedience are Imaan.** Built upon this, Imaan in their view, is attestation, tasdiq and this is in the heart and it is given expression by the tongue. **And what gives clear outward evidence of it, after the affirmation, iqrar (of the tongue), is the testimony of the pillars (arkaan), which are three in number: testimony (shahadah), belief (i’tiqad) and action (‘amal).**

The testimony makes a person’s life sacred and his wealth forbidden (to be taken unlawfully), and also makes the rulings of Allaah come into effect (with respect to this person). And action necessitates the [upholding of the] religion and justice.

So these two outward matters (the testimony and action) bring about the outward Shari’ah manifestation. And as for belief (‘aqidah), then the Hereafter will make it apparent (i.e. what it actually is), since it is hidden (in the life of this world). No one knows it except Allaah.

see the Ash’ariyyah, the Mu’tazilah and the ‘Aqlaaniyyah (Rationalists), those within Ikhwaan ul-Mufliseen, having affectations to the books of Sayyid Qutb. And likewise the Soofiyyah (the Syrian and Jordanian brand) having affectations towards the books of Sayyid Qutb, and similarly the pure Khawarij (the North African brand) having the affectations towards the books of Sayyid Qutb. And then you see in the west, all of the groups and organisations that are an offshoot of the Ikhwaan ul-Mufliseen having affectations towards the books of Sayyid Qutb. And likewise, many of those claiming to be upon the aqidah of the Salaf us-Salih are actually upon the manhaj of Sayyid Qutb (such as the Surooriyyah and the “Qutubiyyah Jadeedah”).

And then you will probably already have observed from all of these groups, how they defend Sayyid Qutb as if he was a Prophet of Allaah, and yet when Ahl us-Sunnah defend the actual Prophets of Allaah, they are enraged... and enter into a state of oblivious denial... and vile partisanship...

BENEFIT: THE AHL UL-BID’AH DIFFER IN THEIR NAMES BUT ARE UNITED UPON THE USE OF THE SWORD

Abu Qilaabah said, **“Never does a man introduce and innovation except that he makes lawful the use of the sword.”** (Al-I’tisam 1/113 and ad-Daarimee 1/58 no.99)

And he also said (as narrated through Ayub as-Sakhtiyaanee), **“...And certainly their saying differs but they have united upon the sword, and I do not consider their destination to be but the Fire.”** (Ad-Daarimee (1/58 no. 100)

Ayub as-Sakhtiyaanee would call of the People of Innovation, “Khawarij” and would say, **“Verily, the Khawarij differ in their names, but are agreed upon the use of the sword.”** (Al-I’tisam 1/113)

And the **Qutubiyyah Jadeedah** themselves admit that the first to coin the phrase al-Haakimiyyah was Sayyid Qutb and Mawdoodi and whose latter day counterparts made it a fourth and independent category of Tawheed!! Then to be declared an **“innovation”** by the Imaams of the Era!! And what was it that made the Qutubis of Algeria **make lawful the use of the sword?** And what was it that made the Qutubis of Egypt **make lawful the use of the sword?** And what was it that made the Qutubis of Syria **make lawful the use of the sword?** The end result of all of that being the loss of hundreds of thousands of lives, the loss of material wealth and property, destruction of the sanctity of society, **and the further repression of the Muslims!!!** And what is it that unites all of the Qutubiyyah – from amongst the Surooriyyah, the Qataadiyyah, the Bannaawiyyah, the Mis’ariyyah, the Turaabiyyah and other than them from their brethren – **what exactly is it that has made them consider the use of the sword to be lawful?!**

Hence, whoever abandoned the belief, aqidah, of the heart and made outward testification, shahadah is a hypocrite, munafiq. **And whoever, believed it in his heart, expressed it with his tongue but then abandoned acting upon the obligatory duties out of disobedience, then he is a sinner, fasiq, who does not leave the fold of Imaan (i.e. Islaam)**⁴⁸, however he is one who is deficient, neglectful, and the rulings pertaining to the Muslims (in this regard) will fall upon him. Unless, O Allaah, he leaves them while he denies and rejects their obligation (jaahidun bi wujoobihaa), in which case he is a disbeliever, kafir, whose blood is lawful and whose killing is obligatory.

As for the one who believes with his heart that Allaah is alone, not having no partner, and who affirms Allaah both in terms of existence and knowledge, as was said by Abu Ja'far Muhammad – may Allaah be pleased with him – to the bedouin who said to him, “Do you see Allaah when you worship him?” So he replied by saying, “I would not have worshipped Him if I had not seen Him.” So the bedouin asked again, “How did you see Him?” He replied, “It is not the sight that sees Him through the eyes, but it is the heart that sees Him with the realities of Imaan. He is not perceived by the senses and nor does He resemble the people. But He is known by the signs, aayaat, and is characterised by names [and attributes]. He is not unjust in His affairs. Such is Allaah, besides whom there is none worthy of worship.” The bedouin then said to him, “Allaah knows best where He places His Risalah (Message)”.

So based upon this, if he expressed with his tongue that which we have mentioned above (i.e. the belief) and acted upon what is obligatory upon him with his limbs, and attested to whatever has come to him from His Lord on the tongue of His Prophet (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam), holding that it is correct, that it is wisdom and justice and that showing obedience in all of that is necessary, and also avoided the destructive major sins, then he is a believer in truth. His Imaan will increase with obedience and decrease with disobedience. He would be deserving of reward on account of acts of obedience and would be secure from punishment by abandoning acts of disobedience.

However, he will be in between two situations: Fearing his Lord due to the threat He has made for the destructive sins, and hoping in Him due to the forgiveness He has promised. Hence, he will be in between the states of fear and hope.”⁴⁹

⁴⁸ Bearing in mind the difference of opinion concerning the abandonment of prayer, out of laziness and neglect.

⁴⁹ ‘Aqaa'id ath-Thalaath wa Sab'eena Firqah' (pp. 313-314) of Abu Muhammad al-Yamani who lived around 530H (the times of his birth and death remain unknown).

IMPORTANT REFLECTIONS

There is no doubt that **after the passing away of the two great Imaams**, the tribulations have increased and the controversies diversified – there being no escape from this due to what Allaah has promised of the taking away of the Scholars and the raising of the Knowledge (with them). And what has further kindled the flames of tribulation is the emergence of the ignorant and lowly pretenders (ar-Ruwaibidah), and the Arbaab (Lords) of Adulterated Principles – and their supporters and helpers – from amongst the rowdy hooligans and other than them - **who take the verdicts of the scholars in order to cause strife and then befool and beguile the common-folk**⁵⁰ – those who lack knowledge and insight. And they have feigned ignorance, and made great the ignorance, of the fact that this Noble Deen is based upon the clear texts of the Book and the Sunnah upon the understanding of the Sahaabah, and that everyone's saying can be taken and rejected – and that consideration is given to what conforms to the truth and that consideration is given to the meanings established in the texts of the Book and the Sunnah, not the newly-invented terminologies used by Ahl ul-Bid'ah in order to assault Ahl us-Sunnah.

But this new generation and its mentors and leaders, in the days gone by, would contend with the great and Noble Imaams of our time, in issues of current affairs, accusing them of ignorance and being “controlled from above” and having no other function but to “announce the beginning and end of Ramadan” being a “monopoly in the hands of those above them” as would occur from the political activists and their likes. And in those days they would forbid taqleed of the Ulamaa' on the basis that these scholars do not know anything of the current affairs, having reached old age and senility, and that they are busy dealing with the personal affairs of people – and that the real Lords of Current Affairs are themselves⁵¹.

⁵⁰ And we have certainly observed them coming out in their droves – the very ones who accuse the Salafis of teaching the Muslims everything but Tawheed – and then displaying their two-faced foolishness and hypocrisy by spreading the verdict of the Committee in all the horizons of the Earth – making an exegesis of it, and spreading it in their mailing lists, to the common Muslims, and other than them (such as the one who calls himself Abu Sayf – belittling the knowledge of the Imaam, the Muhaddith, the Faqeeh, al-Albaani, the while he himself cannot even translate the fatwaa correctly – ignorant of the Arabic language and its constructs (!), ignorant of his own self and his limitations, and then exceeding all bounds and passing judgement on the aqeedah and manhaj of the Mashayikh of Ahl us-Sunnah!!)

⁵¹ And this is an ancient legacy, one that originated with the Ahl ul-Bid'ah of old who would accuse the likes of Ibn Seereen and Hasan al-Basri of having no concern but the affairs of menstruation, as occurs in the book of ash-Shatibi 'al-I'tisam' when he mentions about a person from the Innovators that he said, **'the thought of Ibn Seereen and Hasan al-Basri is one that does not extend beyond the torn veins in menstruation'**!! And another one said, **'Certainly, the thought of ash-Shafi'ee and Abu Haneefah does not go beyond the women's undergarments'**!! And these were but the Mu'tazilah who revelled in their rationalism and toying with logic and philosophy in order to interpret the Book of Allaah and the Sunnah and they rebuked anyone who would not take to indulgence in what they had taken to indulgence of their fiqh ul-waqi' (understanding of the true state of affairs)!!

And their latter-day counterparts – the Lords of Current Affairs – resorted to the same, in their belittlement and humiliation of the People of Knowledge, when they did not agree to their whims and desires and their erroneous views – and who do not subscribe to their exaggeration in their new brand of 'fiqh ul-waqi'.

Stated Safar al-Hawali, in his self-aggrandisement, “I will say a word to our Ulamaa'... we do not always throw the blame in one direction only... **especially for the one who lives under contention and in particular circumstances and upon whom (making) flattery and (certain) rules of behaviour are required...** Yes, **they have a deficiency in knowing the state of affairs, they have deficiencies which**

we can complete and perfect... because we have witnessed and lived these events and **they have not witnessed these events, on account of the time period that they have lived (i.e. they lived in a different era)...** I say: May Allaah reward the Ulamaa, but we will complete (their deficiency) and perfect them, **and we shall explain to them the true affairs...** and alongside that I say that the fundamental responsibility is upon us foremost, we the seekers of knowledge... **and some of those Ulamaa have begun to relinquish the affair (to others) because he is coming to the end of his age...** so they are thinking about who will succeed them, they think 'Who?'..." (Cassette: "Fa Firroo Ilallaah")

Salman al-Awdah states, **"Do you want the scholar to remain limited only to the rulings of sacrifices, game, rituals, women's menses and impurities, ablution, ghushl, and wiping over the khuffs?"** As occurs in " (Cassette: Ash-Shareet al-Islami, Ma Lahu wa ma Alaihi)

And he says in the same cassette, **"Where is the benefit or worth in a scholar if he does not explain the political affairs to the people, those which are the most important of the affairs that they are in need of."**

And he states, **"Indeed, the positions of religious authority have become a monopoly in the hands of the well-known bands [of individuals], amongst those who excelled in the art of compromise and deception. And, in the view of the authorities, they have become the chief spokesmen in the name of Islam and the Muslims despite the fact that they have no role to play except in two matters, 1) Announcing the commencement and end of Ramadan and 2) Attacking those whom they call extremists."** (Cassette: Haqeeqat at-Tatarruf)

Salman al-Awdah also stated about the Gulf War , **"...it revealed the fact that there is no correct and reliable knowledge based reference point in existence (for giving verdicts), one that is able to comprehend the various differences and is able to provide a correct and ready made solution and detailed and proper analysis..."** (Al-Islah, dated 3/12/1992)

And he means by that in the land that he is living, the land of the Permanent Committee and the Scholars of the Salafi Da'wah, Ibn Baz, Ibn Uthaimen, al-Fawzaan...

And all of this when the Ulamaa would not agree to their views on Fiqh ul-Waqi' (Current Affairs) and their verdicts!!

And Abdur-Rahman Abdul-Khaliq reviled the Ulamaa with ugly and despicable titles. He called the 'Ulamaa of Tawheed: **"The 'Ulamaa of Menses and Womens Impurities", "The 'Ulamaa of the Manners of the Toilet", "Mummified" and "The Skin-Deep 'Ulamaa".** He described Imaam ash-Shanqeetee: **"Perfect and Complete Ignorance"** and also: **"If the lowest level of uncertainty (shubhah) was thrown at him [i.e. a question] he would not be able to respond to it".**

He also said: "Those who are like of him [i.e. Shanqeetee] are tens of 'Ulamaa (in number)". He described the Saudi 'Ulamaa - in the cassette 'al-Madrasah as-Salafiyyah': **"Their da'wah does not equal anything because their da'wah is restricted to a few issues of Tawheed ul-Uloohiyyah"** and that **"they never cease to talk about issues that are dead and bygone."** In his new book: 'Mashroo'iyat al-Amal al-Islaamee' he describes the 'Ulamaa of Saudi - those who forbid membership to organisations as: **"a gathering of blind men who have given themselves the role of leading the ummah with their verdicts".**

For a full documentation of these slanders, their sources and references, refer to the book "An-Nasr al-Azeez 'Alaa ar-Radd al-Wajeez" of Shaikh Rabee' as well as "Jamaa'ah Waahidah" to which 6 Mashayikh wrote an introduction (including Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan), each of them making mention of or actually documenting some of these great slanders of Abdur-Rahman Abdul-Khaliq against whoever did not agree with his Qutubi and Bannaawi views - until even his own teachers!! And it is unfortunate that this new generation of rowdies, when matters like these are brought to their attention - those that occurred from their mentors and leaders - exclaim, "this needs to be verified!" throwing themselves into a state of oblivious denial!! And then they proceed to quote general statements of praise to override what has occurred from these individuals of scathing attacks and sarcastic mockery of the Ulamaa - another manifestation of their oblivious denial and affectations to the legacy of the bid'ah of al-Banaa, al-Muwaazanaah.

So the issue in those days of forbidding taqleed was one of political expediency – and not one of conformity with the evidences and the dictates of the Book and the Sunnah, for the Lords of Current Affairs displayed their internal turmoil and repugnant contradictions and love of talk – they forbade the use of foreign forces in the Gulf War (because the Sharee’ah forbade that in absolute terms, as they demonstrated with their evidences) – rebuking our Noble Scholars in all of that, accusing them of ignorance and what is worse, of senility and being controlled - but then allowed it in Bosnia, Afghanistan and Kurdistan. They aggrandized and praised the Islamic states of Sudan and Afghanistan - since in their view, these states were the embodiment of Islaam and the closest thing to the Khilaafah - but then (some amongst them) performed Hijrah to the lands of the Mushriks and Infidels, submitting to their secular laws, living under them, with an open heart, and with ease and satisfaction. And then they encouraged the Algerian Revolution, encouraging open demonstrations – opposing our Imaams in that – and deceiving the common folk into thinking that their views are but the views of the Senior Ulamaa – making great the lie.

And this matter - of the scathing attacks of the political activists - was corroborated by Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan in Shaikh Rabee's earlier book, "Jamaa'ah Waahidah" in which he wrote, in his introduction to it: "And from the Ummah of Muhammad, the Ahlus-Sunnah wal Jamaa'ah proceeded upon this methodology, censuring those who split away or deviating, or destroying obedience, or opposing the Jamaa'ah - in order to preserve the unity of the Ummah and uniting the word. But in these later ages Jamaa'ahs associating themselves with dawah, under leaderships particular to themselves, have appeared; each Jamaa'ah lays down a methodology particular to it, and this results in disunity, disagreement and struggles between them - things rejected by the religion and forbidden in the Book & the Sunnah. **Then when the scholars censured this strange and suspicious behaviour of their's some brothers began to defend them and from those who defended them are the noble Shaykh 'Abdur Rahman 'Abdul Khaliq in his printed treatises and his audio tapes - in spite of those who advised him sincerely against this - from his brothers. Then in addition to this he made attacks upon the scholars who do not agree to his action and he described them in an unbecoming manner, and none escaped from that - not even some of his own shaykhs who taught him.**

And our brother the noble Shaykh Rabee' ibn Haadee al-Madkhaalee has replied to him in this book which is now before the reader as is entitled: "Jamaa'ah Waahidah Laa Jamaa'ah, Wa Siraat Waahid Laa 'Asharaat" [A single Jamaa'ah, not Jamaa'ahs: A single way not tens of ways] , and I have read it and found it to amply cover what is required - and all praise is for Allah - and I ask Allah that He causes it to be of benefit and that He rewards him for it, **and that He guides our brother Shaykh 'Abdur Rahmaan to return to what is correct - as he has promised - and may Allah extol and send blessings upon our Prophet Muhammad and his followers and companions.**" Shaikh Saalih ibn Fawzaan al-Fawzaan (14/06/1416H)

And it was by these devised machinations of theirs that the youth began to cause doubts about our Ulamaa, so they began to say, "they are controlled", "they are compromisers", "they are cowards", "they are on the pay roll", "they are hypocrites" and so on – such as what occurred from the mad-dog, the Tahreeri, al-Mis'ari. And it was the likes of Salman al-Awdah who gave their allegiance and support to this mad dog and his concoction of Bid'ah, the CDLR, in their bid to establish the "social justice" of Ibn Qutb. And the Ulamaa spoke against this fitnah, foremost amongst them, Shaikh Ibn Uthaimeen.

So know - O Sunni - the difference between differing with the scholars while maintaining the mannerisms of knowledge and between differing with them and reviling them and slandering their persons and integrity – and do not equate between the Student of Knowledge, who in seeking the truth, guides himself by the texts of the Book and the Sunnah and the statements of the Scholars – upon the principles of Ittibaa' and the mannerisms of the people of knowledge - and between the Lords of Current Affairs who guide themselves by their impulses, opposing the Book and the Sunnah and rejecting the guidance of the Scholars – reviling them when they do not agree with them and accusing them with evil titles and descriptions and making mockery of them!!

And then afterwards when they saw the results of their prattling and idiocy they advised with adherence to the Senior Ulamaa, just as they had advised after that vile and decadent Qutubi – filled with the decadence of his chief and mentor, Sayyid Qutb, murdered the Salafi Shaikh Jameel ur-Rahmaan in Afghanistan – whereas before that a day would not pass by except that the Lords of Current Affairs would release a cassette filled with their sentiments on the subject of Afghanistan. All but love of talk, for the Salaf would know much and talk little, but as for these, they talk much and know little – as they acknowledged themselves after the reality of their knowledge of current affairs was exposed. So they used to belittle and ridicule our Ulamaa and they would accuse with idiocy and blameworthy taqleed those who would adhere to the Ulamaa.

So there is **a mighty difference** between the way of the Lords of Current Affairs, the Activist Thinkers, – in behaving with our Ulamaa on issues of difference - and between the well-trodden path of Ahl us-Sunnah, Ashaabul-Hadeeth, whose following is but Ittibaa' of the evidences from the Book and the Sunnah in any of the affairs of the religion, be they related to creed, methodology or worship or otherwise – and knowing the degree and rank of all those that they take from and knowing that the truth is not embodied in any person after the Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) – unless it is in conformity with the evidences and that everyone's saying can be taken or accepted – **while maintaining the mannerisms of knowledge.**

And it is in this context - **not the politically expedient context of the Lords of Current Affairs, the Lords of Innovated Principles and Qutubiyyah**⁵² - that we have presented to

⁵² **IMPORTANT SUNNI REFLECTIONS!**

ONE: And it is they, the Lords of Qutubiyyah, who innovated the fourth category of Tawheed, which the old Permanent Committee declared “**an innovation**” and which Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen declared “**an innovation**” and anyone speaking with it “**an Innovator who knows nothing of the affairs of the religion and creed**”, and which Imaam al-Albani said “**this is a political weapon and not something by which the they desire to teach Tawheed to the people**”. But what was the reply of the Lords of Bid'ah and Qutubiyyah?

“**There is a difference of opinion amongst the Ulamaa**”!! And so they justified for themselves to abandon the words of the Senior Scholars, when the truth was actually with the Senior Scholars – especially the Imaams of Ahl us-Sunnah – only to run to those lesser than them...

And now they make it haraam for us to claim a difference of opinion on the issue of ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed **when Imaam Ibn Baaz and Imaam al-Albani are in support of both the views of Shaikh Khalid al-Anbari and Shaikh Ali Hasan al-Halabi, let alone other notables from the people of knowledge such as Shaikh Abdul-Muhsin al-Abbaad and Shaikh Salih as-Sadlaan and many others!! So it was lawful for them, but unlawful for us!!**

TWO: And it is also they, the Lords of the Bannaawi Principle, “**Let us come together in that which we agree and let us excuse each other in that which we differ**” – who innovated the Trojan Horse of Ahl ul-Bid'ah, “al-Muwaazanah” (mentioning both the good points and bad points when criticising) – one of the hallmarks of the teachings of Salman al-Awdah and Abdur-Rahman Abdul-Khaliq – which the Ulamaa unanimously refuted, labelling it as an “innovation” and “foolishness” and other than that. But no sincerity of purpose did they show to the Senior Ulamaa then (since the truth was with the Senior Ulamaa) – amongst them both Muhadditheen and Fuqahaa!! **And they allowed it for themselves – making it an excuse only to defend the Innovators and accommodate them. And never did they mention the good points of their opponents - !!! – when they reviled them and slandered them – and nor did they enjoin it upon themselves to write essays in which the good points of all of those who they claimed were spies and paid workers were enumerated, and nor did they include in their cassettes the good points of the likes of Shaikh Rabee' and the Madinah Shaikhs and nor did they extol their virtues, the very virtues that had been extolled by the two Imaams of the Era - while they, the**

Activists, would do nothing but criticise them – displaying their repugnant hypocrisy and two-faced foolishness!! And in place of extolling the virtues of the notables of Ahl us-Sunnah, the Salafi Imaams and Mashayikh – those of sound aqeedah and manhaj - and writing books on their virtues and promoting them to the youth, they replaced it, and began to expound upon the virtues the Heretical Rafidees and Zindeeqs of the Ummah – those of corrupt aqeedah and manhaj – and promoting their books.

THREE: And it is also they, the Lords of Qutubiyyah, who turned the Reviler of the Kaleem of Allaah, Moosa (alaihissalaam) and the Enemy of Uthmaan Bin Affaan (radiallaahu anhu) and the Mukaffir of Banu Umayyah, the one who called for the abolition of some of the Sharee'ah Laws, the adoption of Marxist Socialism in order to "perfect" Islaam, and the Reviver of every repugnant bid'ah that the Ummah has witnessed, - it is they who made this particular Raafidee and Kharijee into an Imaam and enjoined upon the people his books of Bid'ah and Zandaqah – the while he had been refuted by the vast majority of Ahl us-Sunnah and exposed by the Notable Scholars through the decades. **And know that according to the standards of the recent verdicts of the Permanent Committee, the books of Sayyid Qutb are Haraam to be published and distributed due to what they contain of heresy, innovation and misguidance – and due to what they brought about of loss of life and slaughtering of scores of thousands of Muslims through the decades, such as what occurred in Syria, Egypt, and Algeria – and their harmful effect upon the youth of this Ummah cannot be denied save by a biased partisan whose heart has been poisoned with the evil effects of Qutubiyyah!**

Yet alongside all of that – they continued to manifest the Extremism of their Irjaa', in using their innovated principle of al-Muwaazanah to defend him and his evil writings – displaying love and hatred for the sake of this Heretic (who continued to supervise the publishing of his books which contained revilement of Uthmaan (radiallaahu anhu) up until his death, after he had been exposed and refuted by Mahmood Shakir in 1952) but not displaying love for the sake of the Kaleem of Allaah, Moosaa (alaihissalaam), or Uthmaan (radiallaahu anhu) or Banu Umayyah, or the Attributes of our Mighty Lord...So the Lords of Qutubiyyah turned on their backs and fled on their heels and did not show sincerity of purpose to the Ulamaa, Muhadditheen and Fuqahaa, who advised them not to place 'az-Zilaal' on the same footing as the classical tafsirs and that they should not attach the youth to it on account of its heresies...**while at the same time making their wrath descend upon those who promoted the verdicts of the Ulamaa in this regard!!**

FOUR: And have you not observed O Sunni, how the Lords of Qutubiyyah attempted to use the praise of Imaam al-Albani for some of the writings of Qutb – before the truth about Qutb became apparent to him at the hands of the efforts of Shaikh Rabee' bin Haadee – in order to justify the promotion of his heretical writings and his misguidance amongst the youth? Have you not observed O Sunni, how Safar al-Hawali equates between Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah, Shaikh ul-Islaam Muhammad bin Abdul-Wahhaab and Sayyid Qutb!!! The Shaikh of Bid'ah, Dalaalah, and Khaarijiyyah – in his book "Dhaahirat ul-Irjaa'?! And do you not see how he places Imaam al-Albani in the same category as al-Bootee the Innovator and enemy of the Salafi Da'wah – in the same aforementioned book that reached "the extremity in evil" as Imaam al-Albani described it?! Have you not observed O Sunni how the Lords of Qutubiyyah, traverse the land, spreading the (old and outdated) Tazkiyaat (recommendations) for Ahl ul-Bid'ah? But as for the Tazkiyaat of Ahl us-Sunnah for Ahl us-Sunnah – have you not observed how they interpolate them and try to deny them and try to fool the people concerning them? Have you not observed how Imaam al-Albani described Shaikh Rabee' bin Haadee al-Madkhalee – a thorn in the throat of the Lords of Qutubiyyah and a noose around their necks – as **"the carrier of the flag of al-Jarh wat-Ta'deel"** and that **"there is not a single mistake that we have seen from him"** and that **"to him belongs all the knowledge"** and that **"those who refute him do not do so on the basis of knowledge ever"** and that **"whoever criticise him is either an ignoramus or a person of desires"**. Have you not seen how the Lords of Bid'ah and Adulterated Principles swoon as if death is about to overtake them at the mere sight and hearing of these words concerning this Noble Sunni, Salafi, Imaam and Shaikh – and then proceed, in a state of oblivious denial – to make every type of interpolation (ta'teel and ta'weel!!) of these Tazkiyaat (recommendations)? And then they traverse the earth with old and outdated Tazkiyah's for the Imaams of Bid'ah (and the groups of Bid'ah), spreading mischief and corruption therein – deceiving and misguiding the youth? Indeed Allaah has exposed them, and will continue to expose them:

The Muhaddith and Imaam, al-Albani - rahimahullaah - said, commenting upon the book 'al-Awaasim Mimmaa Fee Kutub Sayyid Qutub Min al-Qawasim' of Shaikh Rabee' bin Haadee, **'Everything with which you have refuted Sayyid Qutb is the truth (haqq) and is correct (sawab).** And it will become

you, the reply of the Noble Shaikh, Ali Hasan al-Halabi, to the verdict of the Permanent Committee issued on 14/6/1421H related to his two books on the subjects of takfir and ruling

sufficiently clear from this refutation to every one who has read anything from "The Islamic Heritage" that Sayyid Qutb had no knowledge of the Usool (fundamentals) or the Furoo' (subsidiary matters) of Islaam. **So may Allaah reward you with the best of reward, O brother Rabeei for fulfilling the obligation of explaining and uncovering his ignorance and deviation from Islaam."**

From the Shaikh's own handwritten letter which he wrote prior to his death in 1999. A photocopy of the original is included in the book "Baraa'ah Ulamaa il-Ummah Min Tazkiyat Ahl il-Bid'ah wal-Mudhammah" A copy of the original letter can be found in **NDV010011** at SalafiPublications.Com.

FIVE: And have you not also observed O Sunni, how the Lords of Qutubiyyah and their followers fell into an oblivious state of denial when the Muhaddith of the Era labelled them as **"The Khawaarij of the Era"** due to their performance of takfir on account of sins, and when he labelled their methodology as **"Ikhwaani"**, and when he described one their books as reaching **"the extremity in evil"** and when he said, **"it has become clear to me that our brothers in Madinah were more knowledgeable of them than us"** – and he said all of this after the time he had a good opinion of them (early to mid 90s)? So the rowdy hooligans amongst the biased partisans, then, in order to save face, began to gather, and compile, and record all of the old statements of Shaikh al-Albaani in which he praised and defended their mentors, in the days of old, when their affair was not clear to him, and then presented it to the people – out of deceit and treachery. So then they would interpolate the statements of the Noble Imaam - falling into the blameworthy, ta'teel and ta'weel of Ahl ul-Bid'ah – and then only making the affair worse for themselves, they began to use the old words of the Imaam in praise of some of the writings of Qutb (in order to justify the promotion of his heretical books). So if they took his statements to be authoritative, **why then did they fall into oblivious denial when he spoke of their mentors and leaders, refuted them, spoke ill of them and exposed them and accused them of opposing the manjah and falling into the innovations of the Khawaarij and their writings reaching "the extremity in evil"?!**

SIX: And have you not also understood, O Sunni, how they rejoiced when Shaikh Ibn Baaz wrote a letter of praise for what Abdur-Rahman Abdul-Khaliq had written in his book, hating that anyone should thereafter criticise it and outline some of its errors and orientations, **and then they go on to expose their two-faced foolishness and hypocrisy by performing ta'teel and ta'weel of the praise and recommendation of Shaikh al-Albaani for the book of 'Abdul-Malik ar-Ramadaanee, "Madaarik un-Nadhar", in which the true reality of the Political Activists is exposed and made as clear as the daylight sun (or for the book of Shaikh Rabee' in exposing the scandals of Qutb!!)...** And then thereafter they begin to accuse the author of lying, and then begin to make every possible type of defence for their mentors and leaders...knowing that they had been exposed?!! Despite the fact that Shaikh al-Albaani carefully read the book beginning to end and then described it as **"a unique book on the topic"**, that exposed the callers to revolution and those who **"supported it with their mere sentiments"**?! So when it was the case that **the detailed evidences exposed the nature of the Political Activists**, they then ran to find the general praise of the other Scholars in order to defend their heroes. And this is the nature of the biased partisans, in that what matters to them is the praise and aggrandizement of their mentors – even when it is shown that they are in error – based upon evidences and clarity, not just mere claims. And their example is like that of a man who when he presented with a hadeeth **with its isnaad**, he runs to view of a Scholar in order to reject the hadeeth with and its isnaad. And this is the way of the biased partisans towards the book of Abdul-Malik ar-Ramadhanee – **who dealt first hand with the Political Activists by personal communication and attempted to advise personally (and continued to do so), the likes of Safar and Salman about the results of their prattling, but to no avail.**

And this my dear brother and sister has been their legacy... **multi-faced chameleonism**...and there is much much more, but this is not the place for it.

But as for now, the Lords of Bid'ah and Qutubiyyah have rejoiced, for they have been granted what they always aspired for and had awaited and what their hearts had yearned for – but all of this is indeed a trial and a tribulation for them... **for it has indeed uncovered their deception and treachery from the very beginning...** and it will indeed uncover more in what is yet to come...**and this is indeed a blessing for Ahl us-Sunnah in that the innermost desires have but been brought to the forefront** – for all to see and observe!!

by other than what Allaah has revealed – much to the dislike of every biased partisan – who hates that the truth be known and wishes for nothing but silence from his opponents...

CLOSING REMARKS

Know O Sunni, that the Lords of Adulterated Principles from amongst the Khawaarij, the Qutubiyyah and other than them from the Ahl ul-Bid'ah⁵³ were granted a day of Eid to rejoice with what their hearts had yearned for – only uncovering what is with them of the repugnant Hizbiyyah and two-faced foolishness and the concealing of innovatory suggestions and tendencies.

For they are the ones who attempt and try to make the one who propounded almost every single innovation ever known, who mocked the Kaleem of Allaah, ridiculed Uthmaan (radiallaahu anhu), performed takfir of Banu Umayyah, called for the adoption of Socialism and advised with the abolition of parts of the Sharee'ah – so they have tried to make such a one an Imaam, worthy to be followed, a Shaikh of Islaam⁵⁴ – while at the same time they place our Muhaddith and Faqeeh and Imaam in the league of Jahm Ibn Safwaan?!!!

And this is the way of all of the Ahl ul-Bid'ah, of every age and era, who try to reduce the worth of the Inheritors of the Prophets.

Abu Uthmaan as-Saaboonee (d. 449H) - may Allaah have mercy upon him - said: "And the characteristics [resulting] from [the effects of] innovations upon their people are obvious, and manifestly clear. **The most apparent of their signs and characteristics is the severity of their enmity and hatred towards the Carriers of the Narrations of the Prophet (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam), their disdain of them, their scorn of them** [considering them to be valueless] and naming them with Hashawiyyah (Worthless People), Jahalah (the Ignorant), Dhaahiriyyah (Literalists), and the Mushabbihah (those who liken Allaah to the creation). [And this], due to their belief [concerning] the Narrations of the Prophet (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) - that they are devoid of any knowledge and that the [real] knowledge is that which Shaytaan throws at them from the results of their corrupt intellects, the dark whisperings of their chests [i.e. souls], the false notions of their hearts [which are] empty of any goodness, their words and proofs which are devoid [of truth] and their unjustified and futile doubts."⁵⁵

And the Noble Shaikh, Ibn Uthaimeen⁵⁶ has affirmed this affair concerning the people of desires of our times, stating, "**Whoever accused Shaikh al-Albaanee of Irjaa' has erred⁵⁷. Either he is one who does not know al-Albaanee or he is one who does not know Irjaa'**".⁵⁸

⁵³ And amongst them Abu Qataadah, known for his Takfir and Kharijism, and who along with the remainder of the Qutubis of the West, rejoiced and celebrated, wrote and typed, screamed and shouted, and spread and distributed...Indeed the hearts of Ahl ul-Bid'ah resemble each other...

⁵⁴ Like Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah and Shaikh ul-Islaam Muhammad bin Abdul-Wahhaab (!) – as occurs from the author of "Dhaahirat ul-Irjaa'"!!

⁵⁵ Aqeedatus-Salaf wa Ashaabil-Hadeeth (p.101-107)

⁵⁶ Cassette: Makaalamaat Ma'a Mashaayikh ad-Da'wah as-Salafiyyah (Part 4) Dated 12/6/2000CE.

⁵⁷ And we do not negate that amongst them are those who seek the truth and intend the truth, but are in error, either due to their own ignorance, or their lack of ability in these affairs...so may Allaah correct their affairs and show them the way that is straight...and protect them from the sedition-makers amongst the Lords of Qutubiyyah...

Al-Albaanee is a man from Ahl us-Sunnah – may Allaah have mercy upon him –, a defender of it, an Imaam in Hadeeth. We do not know of anyone who has surpassed him in our time. However, some people – and we ask Allaah’s pardon – **have jealousy in their hearts. For when [one of them] sees that a person has been met with acceptance [by the people], he begins to find fault with him on account of something, just like the hypocrites, those who used to defame those believers who would give freely in charity – and those [i.e. hypocrites] who would find nothing but the striving of [the believers].** So they would defame the one who would give charity in abundance, and also the poor person who would give charity!

We know the man from his books – may Allaah have mercy upon him – and I know him from sitting with him on occasions. He is Salafi in aqeedah, of sound manhaj. **However some people desire to perform takfeer of the servants of Allaah on account of something that Allaah did not perform takfeer of them. Then they claim that whoever opposes them in this takfeer is a Murji’ – a lie, slander, and mighty fabrication⁵⁹. Therefore, do not listen to this saying regardless of whomever it comes from!”⁶⁰**

Know that those **who use the verdict** of the Permanent Committee⁶¹ in order to establish the accusation of Irjaa’ against the Muhaddith of the Era and his students, are either in error, or ignorant, or jealous, or wish to perform takfir of the people, or have an innovation to hide. And it is for this reason you see them promoting the discussion of issues that the common-folk do not understand, such as “shart us-sihhah” and “shart ul-kamaal” and “jins ul-‘amal” and “ahaad ul-‘amal” all in order to establish that their opponents are guilty of Irjaa’.⁶²

⁵⁸ “**Or he does not know either of these two, which is the reality of those!!**” as said by Shaikh Ali Hasan (Ta’reef wat-Tanbi’ah p.106)

⁵⁹ And we have seen the way of the Mukaffirah, performing takfir of the sinners and rendering whole Muslim societies and nations states apostate!! And then they accuse those who do not agree with them as being Murji’ah!!

⁶⁰ And reflect upon this advice well O Sunni!! And let not the seekers of fame and glory, and the seekers of seats in parliament, and the seekers of the reins and thrones of power and the callers to revolutions and rebellions deceive you!!

⁶¹ **IMPORTANT BENEFIT:** And we hold that the Permanent Committee has indeed erred – may Allaah straighten its affairs – **yet that does not diminish the benefit it has given to Islaam and the Muslims, and nor does it diminish what is due to it** – however, when it is the case that the Permanent Committee has opposed some of the previous verdicts, **let alone opposing the two Imaams of the Era**, then with the mannerisms of knowledge and due respect – we do not take their saying at the cost of opposing those who are greater than them – and this is our stance towards them – much to the dislike of the Qutubiyyah and other than them from the brethren of the Khawarij – who wish to separate the Ummah from its Scholars – as has been their legacy!

But as for the Qutubiyyah and their brethren – then they have only now arisen from their long sleep - and stood to defend the Permanent Committee – whereas aforesaid the Permanent Committee was a “monopoly in the hands of the authorities”, whose position necessitated that they “make flattery” of their masters and who only knew the matters of “women’s impurities”.

⁶² Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen was asked, “What is your viewpoint concerning the one who says, “The one who abandons actions generically (jins ul-‘amal) is a kaafir, and the one who leaves actions solitarily (aahaad ul-‘amal) is not a kaafir?”

In short, we say, as we have said, before, it is sufficient honour and integrity for the servants of Allaah that they defend the honour of those praised by the Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam), the Muhadditheen, the Carriers of his narrations, and their students⁶³, those with sound aqeedah and manhaj – when the situation demands that, and justice requires it - and it is sufficient disgrace and ignominy for the Lords of Qutubiyyah that they defend and aggrandise the Mockers of the Prophets and the Defamers of the Companions and the Revivers of Innovation and the Slanderers of the Ulamaa of the Ummah.

May the peace and prayers be upon the Messenger, Muhammad, his family and his companions, and in Allaah lies all success.

The Shaikh replied, **“Who spoke of this principle? Who said it?! Did Muhammad the Messenger of Allaah say it?! These words have no meaning to them. We say, whoever Allaah and His Messenger have declared a disbeliever then he is a disbeliever. And whoever Allaah and His Messenger do not declare a disbeliever is not a disbeliever. This is what is correct. As for “jins ul-amal” and “aahaad ul-amal” then all of this is but nonsense (clangor) and in which there is no benefit.”** (Cassette: Question From Qatar on the Accusation of Irjaa Against al-Albaani, 30th April 2000)

⁶³ And some have tried to claim that the Noble Shaikh does not have any students! And perhaps we will uncover this fraud on another occasion, if Allaah wills.